

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1888.

MATTER AND MANNER IN LITERARY COMPOSITION.

It is not without reflection that I put the conjunction *and* between the two principal words of the title of this paper. That conjunction strikes the key-note of what the paper will try to say, namely, that, since every literary product necessarily has manner as well as matter, as necessarily no literary product is worthy of unreserved commendation, unless in it not only matter, but manner also, is adequately attended to. In no other form would the title have said this. "Manner as opposed to matter" would have implied to a greater or less extent an incompatibility between the terms; while any other expression that readily suggests itself would have involved a notion of at least the inferiority of one or the other element of the composition. In fact, however, the terms are interpenetrating and mutually dependent; it being a truism that matter can not exist without form nor form without matter.

A discussion of style, then, that proceeds in forgetfulness of this mutual dependence of form and content, necessarily shoots wide of the mark. And yet it was exactly this dependence that a recent discussion seemed to me to forget. In the late Modern Language Convention, a paper by President Shepherd, of Charleston College, on the English of Lord Macaulay, provoked a deal of caustic criticism, unfair, I believe, because one-sided. Never before, perhaps, was Macaulay assigned so hopelessly low a place on the roll of English prose authors. Professor Hart, of Cincinnati, who said that Macaulay always seemed to him to write as if some one were looking over his shoulder and saying, "Bravo! Lord Macaulay; how well you have turned that sentence;"* Professor Hunt, of Princeton, who declared that he had yet to receive from Macaulay the slightest intellectual stimulus;—both ignored, as it seems to me, this fundamental principle of the inseparability, except in thought, of matter and form in literary composition, both

*Quoted from memory.

spoke as if the only merit in composition were its expressing worthy thought. Professor Hunt did, indeed, confess that about no other writer had such widely different opinions been expressed, and that the nearly untounded popularity Macaulay had attained was certainly a sign of some power in him; but it was left for another speaker to remind the Convention of the indissoluble bond between form and content; while even he damned the illustrious Englishman with faint praise by saying (in effect) that his style was an excellent poison with which to inoculate beginners against the more dreadful forms of "fine writing."

Now Macaulay's case is, of course, but one instance under the principle; and the discussion intended here is of the principle, not of any concrete instance of it. Let us grant, then, freely the many defects of Macaulay both in thought and in style. President Shepherd undoubtedly praised him over much; his weaknesses are patent, and need not even be specified. They lie on the very face of his style; his brilliancy itself making them glare at us the more rudely and insist the more strongly on being observed. But has Macaulay, therefore, no points of excellence? Is only the novice, never the practised critic, impressed by him? Or, to put the question more broadly, is there no merit in a fine style? Is such a style necessarily bad? Are we to attend only to the thought of a composition? Is it not, rather, manifestly unfair to single out a writer's defects, however glaring they are, and dwell on them, holding them so close to our eyes the meanwhile that we can not see his excellences at all?—can not see the woods for the trees, as the German proverb has it? Granted that we outgrow such a writer as Macaulay; what is it that we outgrow? Surely not his clearness, not his power of calling for us spirits from the vasty deep, not his admirable choice of words, not any of the merits of his style. Why, then, should we not gratefully recognize these merits and confess them elements of a real and true success? On the other hand, we do tire of the inherent contradiction between these excellences of

form and the writer's too evident failure to maintain his thought at a correspondingly high standard. Such brilliancy of style has a right to exist only as growing naturally out of a correspondingly brilliant body of thought; and the critic is fairly entitled to say so. But he is manifestly unfair when he says this without conceding the other truth; when he holds the writer up to ridicule as posing before a looking-glass and saying, "Ah, you handsome dog!" when, in fact, though the writer is a bit self-conscious, he really gives us something fine to look at.

Suppose, for example, that Macaulay had thought as Carlyle thought. Would the brilliancy of his style in that case have offended us? Nay, would not his many charms of manner, unimpaired as they would then have been, only have added to his legitimate effect upon us? We were told in the Convention that Carlyle first wrote as Macaulay did, but afterwards deliberately changed his style. But why? Was it not because he believed that, by intentionally adopting the peculiarities that characterize his later work, he would the more certainly secure an audience? Surely, there was never a more conceited, self-conscious great man than Carlyle. *Vice versa*, suppose that Carlyle's style had remained more finished. Would his influence have been less? Nay, is it not despite his crudities, his "Babylonian dialect," as Alexander Everett called it, that he influences us at all?—despite that boisterousness and utter want of self-containment which have secured for him the epithet *megalosaurian*? Or, let us take some examples nearer home. Surely, the charm of the *Mosses from an Old Manse* and the sustained interest of *The House of the Seven Gables* are no whit the less because of Hawthorne's almost matchless literary form? On the other hand, Mr. Marion Crawford is not at all a great novelist—great as Thackeray or Dickens or even Bulwer is great. Yet Mr. Crawford's style makes many a passage in his works easy that would otherwise be the roughest sailing: nay, more, it furnishes us throughout his writings with one legitimate object of admiration, even where the body of thought is of a texture too light to be valued for itself.

Not that I would champion mere manner.

When a man has nothing to say, by all means let him say it—as the familiar epigram warns us; but when he has something to say, why shall he not say it as well as he can? What do Professor McMaster's cross-section pictures of American life in 1789 lose by being painted in the brightest colors? Or what does Carlyle gain by his eccentricities of style? If a writer's only true object is to influence his age or succeeding ages, if the man of letters should be (in Carlyle's own phrase) a prophet, what shall he gain by conciliating, as Carlyle has done, only a small audience? Granted that Carlyle's audience is select, if small: he has offended multitudes whom he might have taught, and so has lost no small part of his proper influence. What a power his writings might have wielded, couched in a different style! Or, to take another example, which of the two famous passages in Milton's *Areopagitica* has exerted the greater force in human thinking, that in which a tradesman is described as committing his religion to his pastor for safe-keeping, while he himself is devoted to his trade, or that in which Truth is pictured as hewn, like Osiris, into a thousand pieces, while her sad friends, like Isis, make careful search for her members? Both passages express worthy thought, thought often dwelt upon in our own times; both rise above the plain style of ordinary prose; each contains a figure of speech worked out to its utmost limits. But the style of the first passage is affected almost to awkwardness; and the truth it contains is to-day re-expressed by our own writers in many different ways. The second passage, inimitable and almost unprose-like as it is, nevertheless impresses the most casual reader, and is quoted daily from a score of commonplace-books. Its delicate style has kept it sweet through all the ages.

Once more, why is it that Milton's prose or the prose of Sir Thomas Browne is so little read to-day? To say that Milton's poetry overshadows his prose, or that the topics on which he wrote are no longer "living" topics of thought, is no reason why the *Urn Burial* or the *Religio Medici* should not be known. Sir Thomas Browne wrote no verse; and a more profitable book even for our study than the *Urn Burial* might be looked for in vain.

Its inverted and otherwise un-modern style alone seals it from all but a select few readers.

The truth, then, would seem to be as stated in my opening paragraph, that both a good style and a worthy body of thought are necessary to the ideally perfect composition. This certainly was George Saintsbury's opinion when, in February 1876, he printed in the *Fortnightly Review* his paper *Modern English Prose*, a paper in which, lamenting the prevailing neglect and consequent decay of English prose style, he declares this decay not "a mere isolated fact," but "a change which has affected English Literature to a degree and in a manner worthy of the most serious consideration." The fine old English style, he hints, has gone out with the fine old English gentleman, till, in this ultra democratic age, a certain coarseness of manner is as noticeable in literary composition as it is in the conduct of people who profess themselves of the *beau monde*. Mr. Saintsbury actually describes the symptoms of this change, details its causes, and lays down the duty of the critic in view of it; showing by his earnestness and the minute attention he gives the subject, how real and how serious he considers the phenomenon to be.

The opposite opinion, however, has no little vogue. Buffon's doctrine that style is the man himself is interpreted by many teachers to mean that the individuality of a writer is expressed only in his thought; that we are to know an author solely by the opinions he expresses. That the foot of Hercules,—or rather his hand,—shall also betray him, seems to these critics an incredible idea; and their depreciation of form, of style in this its truest sense, grows in proportion. Less and less attention is paid to how an author writes, more and more to what he says. Worse than this, perhaps, the very springs of our literary supply are left unfilled; until, in the mid-winter dearth that would seem to be threatening us, we shall have only to deplore our insensate folly in neglecting the precautions that might—doubtless would—have secured us springs filled to overflowing. The study of rhetoric and criticism is too much neglected by us. Language studies are too often only philological; or, at best, the student is left to acquire a good style by "absorption." Cer-

tain worthy writers are put before him; their biography, the history of their times, the history of literature in general, are taught him; but the fundamental truths according to which the authors are good here and bad there, are not taught him. Even questions of grammatical purity are treated as of little value, and, with the weightier matters of sentence and paragraph building, unity of composition, clearness, force, and other such topics, are hustled out of court in quiet contempt.

Even professed English scholars give us some extraordinary examples of this neglect of manner in their hot pursuit of excellent matter. Thus, from a recently published book on English prose literature I extract the following curious fagots of crooked sticks:—

"Then follows, *The Chronicle*, compiled, partly, by Alfred, and partly, by Plegimund and other less known annalists. This collection, unimportant as it is in itself or in its literary character, is invaluable in its historical and civil bearings. Beginning long before the Conquest, *it* runs nearly a century beyond *it* and thus serves to cherish the First-English spirit and language. As the earliest history of any Teutonic people in a Teutonic language, and with the *Laws* the earliest *form* of English Prose, it has an interest and [a] value quite aside from its contents. Alfred did for *it* [what? the *Chronicle* or "the earliest form of English Prose" the *Chronicle* embodies?] what Chaucer did for English Poetry. He made *it* [?] national, so that from his time to the death of Stephen *it* [?] was the people's authority. Above all, *it* [?] was English clear and clean and lies back of all later English as a basis and guide."¹

Could anything be more inartistic, unless, indeed, it is the same author's constant practice of referring to headings on his page by mere demonstratives, and of thus making these headings part of his text? For example, treating of Dr. Johnson's style, he writes,

"*This* ² is one of the first features that impress the reader as he studies *this* [?]³ prose structure and diction and it becomes more manifest as the perusal goes on."

¹ The italics, I need hardly say, are mine.

² "Its Anglo-Latin Element."

³ The context does not make this pronoun clear.

*This*⁴ applies to subject matter as well as to method and external form."

"*This*⁵ is a failure common to periodical writing." [Can the *absence* of impassioned energy be a *failure*?]

All three examples are found within ten pages, and the whole volume is full of similar instances. Thus, among the merits of Johnson's style is "(2) Literary Gravity," and we are informed about it that "*the reference here* is not to that excessive seriousness of manner which often ended in confirmed melancholy but to that sober habit of mind and expression which was based on his view of the writer's vocation."

The same writer, (who, let it be said in justice to him, can write and has written not a little unimpeachable English), is fond of long series of those excessively short sentences which Coleridge condemned as "purposely invented for persons troubled with the asthma to read, and for those to comprehend who labour under the more pitiable asthma of a short-witted intellect." Thus, "The limits of his [Johnson's] life were too narrow to admit of much diversity. His style was affected by these circumstances and especially *in the line of* [!] want of adaptiveness to all classes and phases. His method was rigid and mechanical and the same to all. He would talk to Goldsmith and Savage and the artisan in the same manner. Whatever the topic might be, the treatment of it was the same. The narrative, [the] descriptive, [the] didactic and [the] critical were all run in the same mold and branded with the common mark. They are all in the phrase of Macaulay, 'Johnsonese.' His prose style, as his body, was very much opposed to change. Starting in one direction and at a certain pace he maintained it to the end. In all this he was true to his nationality. In that he was lethargic, he was English. The phlegmatic element in him was native to the realm. The Gallic verve and sprightliness was [sic] as foreign to him as *it* was to his country. He was constitutionally and mentally heavy and could not face about at will. There are few scenes in literary history so amusing as *when* this ponderous man attempts

⁴ "The Want of Flexibility and Adaptation."

⁵ "Absence of Impassioned Energy."

to be playful and unbend himself to passing changes. While he is unbending, the opportunity passes. *Here* [!] as in the case of diction, naturalness covers many sins. The very uniformity of his prose is natural. It is a fault and yet modified by the fact that it is purely individual and characteristic."

One is reminded of the criticism by Theseus of Quince's famous speech "for the Prologue," "This fellow doth not stand upon points."

So, Mr. Sweet, *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. xlv., finds it in his conscience to write, "Adjectives have the three genders of nouns, and *the same* cases, *with the addition of* the instrumental, *ending in e*, which only occurs in the masc. and neut. in the sing.: in the fem. sing. and in the plur. *its* place is taken by the dat.⁶ *They* also have a strong and [a] weak inflection, the latter employed after the definite article and demonstratives generally." Can contempt for form go further? Or is this utter want of style merely an unconscious imitation (as the abbreviations are a conscious following) of the great German philologist Dr. Witternsieus?

Even trained theologians and preachers are not free from such blunders. Thus, in a recent most important contribution to the history of Christianity, I find the following slips (with many more) in the work, the style of which is in general by no means bad:—

"The statesman or [the] ecclesiastical politician whose object it was *not to attain* [=to attain not] martyrdom but triumph."

"The Greek fathers could not *escape* [have escaped], even *had they been inclined* to do so, from the influence of a philosophy like the Stoic."

"The truth of the incarnation as that which *can alone* [=alone can] meet the needs of speculative enquiry."

Surely, if such things are possible in the writings of authors of no little repute, it is time that some one raised his voice in behalf of a more careful, more conscientious cultivation of style. Nor is any author to be judged without mercy, who, no matter what his shortcomings in thought, has set us so illustrious an example of the importance and the effect

⁶ The abbreviations are, of course, Sweet's.

tiveness of attention to points of style as Macaulay has set. Granting all that can be said as to Macaulay's mannerisms,—even conceding that he paid, perhaps, too much attention to mere form,—he remains a model of diligence, of "curious care" in expression, that we dare not despise, and in reading whom the young writer makes a very judicious start.

Should a philosophic basis be demanded for the position taken in this paper, it is not far to seek. Composition is an art, and in every art-process three elements enter,—matter, or content; form, or style; and purpose, or end in view. Granting that of these three the first is chief, does it follow that the others or either of them is of no account? How is it in music, in painting, or even in the technical arts, such as engineering? Shall a painter, because he has a noble picture in his mind, daub it on his canvass, so that we must struggle to discover his thought or his purpose? Is Wagner or Beethoven the greater musician? Browning or Tennyson the greater poet? Which has most clearly set out to less gifted mortals the God-inspired blessings of sound or thought with which his own soul was enriched and exalted? It can not be that with regard to art in general two opinions can prevail on this subject: why should we be able to entertain them with regard to the particular art of composition?

It is quite possible, then, to overstate the chief importance of having something worthy to say,—to state it, indeed, as if it were the only important element of composition. The truth is that success in all particulars is desirable; that Macaulay (for example), whose defects are mainly in matter, is culpable only in another way from that in which Carlyle is to blame, whose defects are in style, and in still another way from that in which De Quincy is wrong, whose defects though in style, are not the same defects of style as Carlyle's. Indeed, if a strict inquiry be made, the purpose of discourse, its moral character, would seem to over-shadow even the having something worthy to say. Many a writer has made shipwreck solely because his work has seemed to lack unity or definiteness of aim, so that his readers, like lost children or Spenser's travellers wandering in Error's den, have

scarcely been able to find their way. On the other hand, no writer is wholly useless who illustrates for us one or another of the elements of good composition. Nay, more; in our day, though a revival of the grand manner of the last century is not desirable, a protest is quite in place against the indifference to manner, the undisguised contempt for it, that seems to be a prevailing affectation among us.

JNO. G. R. McELROY.

University of Pennsylvania.

MODERN LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF FRANCE.

II.

3.—L'ENSEIGNEMENT SECONDAIRE DES JEUNES FILLES.

Colleges for women are a rather new feature in the University of France; they were only created by the law of Dec. 21, 1880. While the president must be a woman, the teachers may be of either sex. The regular course of studies extends over five years and is divided into the *première période*, including the first, second and third year, and the *deuxième période* or *cours supérieur*, comprising the fourth and fifth. Outside of this course there may be organized a preparatory department, which would cover the instruction of the lower and middle course of primary schools required for entrance to the college course. The instruction of the first period is given in classes proper; that of the second, in courses uniting students of the same standing; the modern languages, however, hold an exceptional position, and are taught in courses throughout. The studies are either part of the instruction proper, or accessory exercises, or optional. The instruction proper bears a distinctively literary character; it is based on the French language and literature with the elements of ancient literatures, the modern languages, and universal and national history and geography, which have 52 recitations out of 71 throughout the course; the other 19 recitations are devoted to mathematics, natural science, physics, chemistry, morality, physiology, domestic economy, hygiene, law, and psychology. The accessory

exercises are drawing, penmanship, vocal music, needle work and gymnastics. Optional in the last two years are: drawing, vocal music, the ancient literatures, the elements of Latin, mathematics, economical geography, and animal and vegetable physiology. Few students take all these optional studies; most decide either for a literary or for a scientific line.

One modern language is compulsory from first to last and gets 21% of the recitations of the instruction proper; students are moreover encouraged to take up two or more, but successively, not all at the same time. Italian and Spanish are to be taught, but German and English should be studied in the first place, in view of their incontestable superiority for mental drill (*gymnastique intellectuelle*). The reading matter in English and German equals in most respects that of the other colleges. Of works not given in the list of the classical colleges I mention: J. Habberton, 'Helen's Babies,' Longfellow, 'Evangeline' and other poems; Tennyson, 'The Grandmother,' Ottilie Wildermuth, *Ausgewählte Novellen*; Goethe, 'Iphigenie of Tauris,' and lyrics of the 18th and 19th centuries. On the other hand, several works studied in the classical and special colleges are entirely omitted, others like Shakespeare and Milton are read in family editions, Byron in extracts. Along with the harder works that are examined thoroughly, easier ones are read rapidly; some poetry is committed to memory. The method and end of study resemble more that of the special colleges than that of the classical. While not only the study of grammar but also translation from French into the foreign language is limited to what is indispensable, conversation and original composition receive the greatest attention. Conversation proceeds from simple object-lessons to an interpretation of the foreign authors in their own language; composition, from simple letters to essays on topics from the various studies of the class. The course is completed by an outline of literary history and some remarks on the origin and principal epochs of the language.

The colleges for women deliver a *certificat d'études secondaires* after an examination at the close of the third year, and a *diplôme de fin d'études* after an examination at the end of the

whole course. The students are examined by their own teachers under the presidency of a delegate of the rector. If women wish to present themselves for one of the *baccalauréats* in the examination held by the *facultés*, they are free to do so.

L'ENSEIGNEMENT SECONDAIRE DES JEUNES FILLES.

SUBJECTS. (Age minimum)	Première P. r. de.					Deuxième P. r. de.		Sum total of weekly recita- tions during the entire course.
	1st yr. (12-13)	2nd yr. (13-14)	3rd yr. (14-15)	4th yr. (15-16)	5th yr. (16-17)	6th yr. (17-18)	7th yr. (18-19)	
I.—INSTRUCTION PROPER.								
FRENCH LANG. AND LIT.	5	5	4	4	3			21
MODERN LANG.	3	3	3	3	3			15
HIST. AND GEOG.	4	4	3	3	2			16
SCIENCES.	3	3	4	2	2			13
MORALS, PHYSIOLOGY, ETC.	2	2	2			6
SUM.....	15	15	16	13	12			71
II.—ACCESSORY EXERCISES.								
(PENMANSHIP, VOCAL MUSIC, NEEDLE-WORK, ETC.)								
SUM OF I. & II.	24½	24½	24½	17½	16½			107½
III.—OPTIONAL STUDIES.								
DRAWING				3	3			6
VOCAL MUSIC.....				1	1			2
A { ANCIENT LIT.				3	2			5
ELEMENTS OF LATIN				1	1			2
B { SCIENCES.....				3	5			8
SUM TOTAL.....	24½	24½	24½	28½	28½			130½

III.—HIGHER INSTRUCTION.

The *Enseignement supérieur* is not concentrated in universities, as in England and Germany, but scattered in the *facultés des lettres, des sciences, de droit, de médecine et de théologie*, in various normal and preparatory schools, in the Collège de France and other institutions. We consider here only the facilities afforded for students aiming at professorships in secondary schools, and the requirements made of them in modern languages. First we examine the normal schools, then the study in the faculties, and finally such degrees

and certificates as cannot be obtained without a modern language.

NORMAL SCHOOLS.

There are three principal normal schools: the renowned *École normale supérieure* at Paris, the *École normale spéciale* of Cluny, and the *École normale secondaire de Sèvres*. The first of these prepares professors for the classical colleges and the institutions of higher instruction; the second, professors for the special instruction; the last, women professors for girls' colleges. The course of studies is three years in each, admission by a *concours* (competitive examination); board and tuition are free, in case the engagement of remaining for ten years in the service of the university is kept. Besides these three schools, there is established an *École normale secondaire* at the lyceum of the *chef-lieu* of each *académie*; it is formed by the reunion of the *maîtres répétiteurs auxiliaires* or *élèves maîtres* boarding in the institution.

The *École normale supérieure* does not require any composition in a modern language for admission, but the candidates of the scientific section have to pass an oral examination on the authors read in *Mathématiques spéciales*, those of the literary section on the works prescribed for *Rhetorique* and *Philosophie*. The *École normale spéciale* admits students to both the sections of letters and sciences without a special examination on a modern language; only those who expect to enter the section of modern languages must write a *thème* and *version*. The *École normale secondaire* of Sèvres requires a written *thème* and *version* and an oral examination in a modern language of all candidates. The *écoles normales secondaires* make no special requirements.

THE FACULTIES.

Before the great reform of the last ten years the professors of the *facultés* acted principally as examiners for degrees and lecturers to the general public, and had scarcely any regular students at all. Now the state, the departments and the communes have offered so many inducements to aspirants, that it has become a very important part of the professors' work to prepare students for the *licence* and *agrégation*.

The students are either resident or non-resident. The residents consist of *boursiers*, *maîtres auxiliaires*, *maîtres d'études* and *auditeurs libres*, all of whom are bound to be regular in their attendance. The *boursiers* are either holders of a *bourse de licence* (scholarship) or of a *bourse d'agrégation* (fellowship); the former are given after a *concours*, the latter according to the judgement of the professors of the faculty with whom the candidate has taken his *licence*; both *bourses* are awarded for one year, but can be prolonged for another, and require the ten years' engagement. The non-resident students are mostly teachers of the communal colleges of the academy who are working for a *licence* or *agrégation*. At fixed intervals they send compositions for correction to the professors or *maîtres de conférences*, and on Thursday, the French weekly holiday, they themselves go to the seat of the faculty to attend certain courses, their travelling expenses being partly paid by the state. Not all faculties are provided with a staff of professors numerous enough to prepare for all *licences* and *agrégations*.

LA LICENCE.

The *licence* is the next degree after the *baccalauréat* and cannot be obtained till one year afterwards. There are three different *licences scientifiques* and four *licences de lettres*: the *licence littéraire*, the *licence philosophique*, the *licence historique* and the *licence avec mention 'langues vivantes.'* In the examinations for the literary, philosophical and historical degree the requirements in modern languages are limited to the translation of an easy English or German work of literary, philosophical or historical criticism; for the last degree they are naturally of a more rigorous character. The candidate writes a *thème* and *version* of four hours each, without a dictionary; interprets a text with questions on literature; and translates at sight into the foreign language; besides, he renders into French a passage from a prose author of a second foreign language.

CERTIFICATS D'APTITUDE.

While the examinations for the *baccalauréat* and the *licence* may be taken at any faculty, those for the *certificat d'aptitude* for the second-

dary instruction, and for the *agrégation*, must be completed at Paris. Nobody can obtain a certificate without possessing one of the *baccalauréats* or an equivalent. A modern language is required for the certificate of a professor of the elementary classes of classical colleges, for that of a professor in the literary section of special instruction, for that of a woman professor in girls colleges, and finally, as a matter of course, for the certificate of a professor of modern languages. For the classical professor, German has been compulsory since 1884. A short and easy German text is dictated and translated into French, and *vice versa* a French text into German. Then a German piece is read and partly translated, and some elementary questions are asked and answered in German. The candidate for a literary professorship in the special instruction writes a *thème*, interprets an author and answers a few oral questions on the language and literature. For the girls' colleges, a modern language did not become compulsory till 1886. The scientific section has some oral questions with a *thème* on the blackboard; the literary division, a four hours' *thème* and *version*, followed by some interrogations.

The certificate for the instruction in modern languages enlists our special attention. The candidates take a preparatory and a definitive examination. The former consists of a *thème*, *version* and a French composition without any aid; the latter comprises an oral *thème* and *version*, a *leçon grammaticale*, and a conversation in the foreign language, and two questions, one on the foreign and the other on French literature. The list of authors varies from year to year. In 1886 we find in German: Goethe, 'Götz'; Wieland, 'Oberon'; Gervinus, 'Litteraturgeschichte'; Hauff, 'Lichtenstein'; Mérimée, 'Colomba' and Racine, 'Phèdre' (Acts I. and V.); in English: Miss Austen, 'Pride and Prejudice'; Shakespeare, 'Hamlet'; Montesquieu, 'Grandeur et décadence des Romains.' The pronunciation of the French and the foreign language forms an important factor in the estimate of the jury.

L'AGRÉGATION.

Every candidate for an *agrégation* must be *licencié*; an *agrégé* gets the title of professor

and receives a higher salary than a *licencié* in the same position; the form of the examination is the *concours*. Among the different *agrégations* only that of modern languages, and that of instruction in girls' colleges deserve our notice. The requirements for the *agrégation* of girls' colleges closely resemble those for the certificate of the same schools; the examination for the *agrégation* of modern languages is much harder than that for the corresponding certificate.

The preparatory part contains a *thème*, a *version*, a French composition and a composition in the foreign language; one of these compositions is on a question of literature and the other on a question of language. The first definitive examination is the interpretation of a passage drawn by lot among the German or English classics indicated by the Minister; and an oral *thème*. The list of 1886 shows, for German, works of Lessing, Herder (Ideen), Goethe, Schiller (Balladen), A. W. v. Schlegel (Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur) Platen, Simrock (Das kleine Heldenbuch), La Fontaine, Molière, M. de Staël, Saint-Marc Girardin; for English, among others, pieces from Chaucer, Sir Philip Sidney, Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, Gray, Sterne, Shelley, Ch. Brontë, Green, La Fontaine, Racine and J. J. Rousseau. The second definitive examination comprises two one hour *leçons*, one in the foreign language and the other in French. The subject of the one is taken from one of the authors of the program, that of the other from literary history. The last examination is finally the translation of a prose author of the other modern language into French.

IV.—BOURSES DE SÉJOUR À L'ÉTRANGER.

In conclusion I should like to mention that the French Government sends each year a number of young men abroad to study English and German in the countries where those languages are spoken. The official *plan d'études* of the *écoles primaires supérieures* contains the announcement of an annual *concours* among graduates and pupils of that grade of schools for *bourses de séjour à l'étranger*. Much less known is the fact that normal school teachers also and college graduates are sent abroad. According to the *Kölnische Zeitung*, there were last year eighteen of such young

men in Austria, Switzerland and Germany, and twelve in England. In Germany the college graduates take board in German families and attend the *Unter-* and *Oberprima* of a Realgymnasium; they stay eighteen months, but they must spend that time at two different schools. Before they return to France they send a detailed report of their experiences and observations to the minister of public instruction. Some of these reports which were communicated to Germans show that the young men generally maintain the most amicable relations both with their German fellow students and with the families in which they board. Their progress, furthermore, in learning the German language and in school exercises is very satisfactory.

ADOLPH GERBER.

Earlham College.

THE ANGLO-SAXON *básnian*
and *wrásen*.

The Anglo-Saxon word *básnian*, 'to delay, tarry' etc., though rather odd in appearance, is not so obscure a formation as one might at first suppose. Whatever be the relation between the suffixes of the feminine abstract nouns such as the Gothic *sókns* (suffix *-ni*) and *usbeisns* (suffix *-sni*), it is sufficient for the present purpose to accept the suffix *-sni* (in all probability at first developed in association with dental bases) as an extension of the simple form *-ni*. In accordance with this view Kluge in his *Nominale Stammbildungslehre* § 147 has classed the Gothic *usbeisns* < **usbeidsns*, *anabásns* < **anabáidsns* etc., with *sókns*, *taikns*, *siuns* etc. Kluge has also called attention to the ablaut-variation which is exhibited, for example, in *taikns* and *usbeisns*. By the side, therefore, of **usbeidsni*- we may also place, as formed from the same base-group of the verb *bidan* (A. S.), the stem **báidsni*-. From this we should in Anglo-Saxon obtain **básn* > **básen* 'an abiding, a delay,' the nominal base of the denominative verb *básnian*. In like manner do we find *wrásen* (*inwit-wrásen*, etc.) < **wraidsni*- by the side of the verb *wriðan*. A verb **wrásnian* could also have been formed.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

MODERN LANGUAGES AT CAM-
BRIDGE UNIVERSITY, ENG-
LAND.

Readers of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES will be interested to hear of a meeting of great importance which has lately taken place at Cambridge University, England. The Congress of the National Society of French Professors residing in England was invited by the authorities to a session in the university at which the vice-chancellor and all the masters of colleges were present. The occasion was one of importance in a variety of respects. It was under distinguished patronage, the chairman being M. Waddington, the French ambassador to England, while among those who expressed their strong sympathy with the work of the Congress we meet the names of Lord Lytton (Minister to France), Lord Tennyson, MM. Jules Simon, de Lesseps, Arsène Houssaye, and Jules Ferry. M. Waddington delivered the inaugural address. He referred with pleasure to the recognition of the Congress by the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and expressed the hope that modern languages would soon be placed upon an equal footing with classical and other subjects. Vice Chancellor Taylor emphasized the warm interest felt by the university in the study of French. The most important speech, however, was that made by Professor Seeley, the widely known occupant of the chair of modern history at Cambridge. Professor Seeley's long and varied experience and extensive knowledge make his remarks of special value. He believed that a crisis in education has arrived when it is necessary to accord to modern languages their true and prominent place in modern culture. Recognizing most strongly the value of the classics, "himself a classicist of the classics," he still thought that the needs of modern life were peremptorily demanding very much more devotion to the study of modern languages than had ever yet been accorded them. So far from believing that Latin must be learned in order to teach French, "let us," he said, "teach French in order to learn Latin." He emphasized the immense value of French literature, "a literature not less but more extensive and various than the Greek and Roman literatures them-

selves." "It is absurd," he continued, "to claim the title of humanities exclusively for the classics, to consider that a youth cannot learn grace from Racine, austere purity from Pascal, eloquence from Rousseau, elevation and force from Victor Hugo, not to say from Dante and Goethe." Professor Seeley enumerated the various departments of activity in which the modern languages are of paramount importance, especially history; and strongly objected to the statement that in all respects the classics are the preferable object of study. "The modern literatures cannot be introduced by the ancient, but the ancient literatures can be included in the modern by means of translation." The speaker continued in the same strain, and upon closing his address was greeted with enthusiastic applause not merely by members of the Congress but by some of the dons and by a large body of the students. A banquet at King's College and a *conversazione* at Trinity College supplied the social element of the occasion. A general feeling of unanimity seemed to reign, both as to the hopeful prospect in regard to the academic study of modern languages, and as to the cessation of the all but monopoly which has so long obtained in favor of the classics in the great English universities.

The gentlemen entertained by the university were simply teachers of the French language and not, in any sense, a body of scholars engaged in the advanced study of modern linguistics, in either their scientific or literary aspect. It may fairly be presumed, then, that had the latter important phases of modern language study been duly represented in the Congress, its reception on this occasion would have been all the more enthusiastic and honorable. The scientific attention which the philology of modern languages is now so widely claiming would certainly have secured for a body representing original research as well as practical instruction the especially hearty endorsement of Cambridge University.

It is gratifying to call attention to these signs of the times. The prospects are certainly hopeful when the men who stand guard over the strongholds of classicism are thus frankly outspoken in favor of reform.

T. MCCABE.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA.

The Fifth Annual Convention of the Modern Language Association of America, held at Philadelphia on the 28, 29 and 30 of December, may be considered memorable in the annals of the Association for several reasons: the large number of members attending and the increase in membership; the practical nature of the majority of the subjects treated, and the uniform excellence of the papers; and last, though by no means the least important, the increasing interest which its discussions created in the minds of the more general public, as witnessed in the fulness of the reports of the daily papers. Representing, as such a society does, the progressive rather than the radical spirit of modern education, the extension of its audience to this more general public can not but be attended with the best results, in forming a public opinion which we trust may in some measure correct the utilitarian tendencies so widely prevalent in both our school and college curricula.

Although the order of exercises did not begin, strictly speaking, until Wednesday evening, December 28, Dr. William Pepper, Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, received informally at his house, on Tuesday evening, such delegates as had already arrived. Quite a number availed themselves of Dr. and Mrs. Pepper's kind hospitality.

During Wednesday, in accordance with the provisions already made by the Local Committee, the delegates were enabled to visit such places of interest in and about Philadelphia as proved most attractive.

On Wednesday evening, the Association met at the University of Pennsylvania to listen to Provost Pepper's Address of Welcome, and to hear Professor James MacAlister in an address on "The Place of Modern Literature in the Education of Our Time." In the absence of James Russell Lowell, the president of the association, and of W. T. Hewett of Cornell University, the second Vice-president, Professor James M. Garnett, of the University of Vir-

ginia, presided. Provost Pepper, after stating that "the association's success was due to the strong personality of its membership as well as to the strong public interest in the subject they represented," went on to say that while the association must take the lead in an attack on classicism, such attack in its hands must be free from wanton and destructive measures; for none could be more favorable advocates for the just claims of the Greek and Latin languages than the members of the association. He held that the object of the association was to emphasize its belief "that the modern languages have an equal claim with the classics," in modern education. Provost Pepper concluded with appropriate words of welcome in behalf of the authorities of the University of Pennsylvania and of the local committee.

It must be confessed that, in the address which followed, Professor MacAlister materially departed from the very moderate views just expressed by the Provost. He claimed that the present system, in which the classics still maintained an ascendancy in education, could not last; that "the final outcome must be a distinctive system based on the foremost human achievements of modern times. Dante, Cervantes and Goethe, may be taken as the types of modern culture. They can teach us more than all the ancient writers." At the close of the exercises the University gave a reception to the members of the Convention.

The second session opened on Thursday morning with the reading of the annual report by Professor A. Marshall Elliott of Johns Hopkins University. This was followed by the appointment of various committees; notably one to consider the advisability of memorializing Congress for an abolition of the tariff on imported books. The reading of papers then began. Professor Albert H. Tolman of Ripon College, Wisconsin, read the first paper, which treated of the Style of Anglo-Saxon Poetry. After an intelligent consideration of the contending verse theories as now held by Heinzel, Rieger, ten Brink and others, the speaker devoted his attention to a minute consideration of style proper, laying particular stress upon the vigor and strength of the metaphorical and disconnected style of the early Anglo-Saxon poets. In the discussion

that followed, in which Professors Hart, Bright and Hunt took an active part, especial emphasis was laid upon the necessity of a complete renovation of the entire subject of Anglo-Saxon versification in the light of the later researches of Professor Sievers in this field.

Professor Tolman was followed by Professor H. S. White of Cornell University, on "The Modern Language Seminary System." He spoke at length upon the needs of our colleges for intelligent work under the personal supervision of competent instructors, and of the equipment necessary to carry out these requirements. In closing, Professor White was particularly happy in calling attention to the words of James Russell Lowell in his address at Harvard last year, that "language should be made a ladder for literature, and not literature a ladder for language."

The morning session was brought to a close with an elaborate essay on the "Face in the Spanish Metaphor and Proverb," by Professor Henry R. Lang of New Bedford, Mass.

After luncheon, which was served in the University, the reading of papers was resumed. Professor Sylvester Primer's paper on "Charleston's Provincialisms" elicited enthusiastic approval, and led to lengthy discussion and comparison of various provincialisms which are still lurking among us. Prof. Joynes, of South Carolina College, gave especial weight to climatic influences in their effect upon pronunciation. However, from the number of parallel cases mentioned by those taking part in the discussion, we may affirm that perhaps not the least difficult part of Professor Primer's task for the future will be found in the discovery of what are and what are not provincialisms peculiar to Charleston.

Professor Henry Wood, of Johns Hopkins University, followed with a paper on "The Brief, or Pregnant, Metaphor in the Minor Elizabethan Dramatists." In the treatment of the brief metaphor he found the greatest originality of the Elizabethan dramatic style, and showed that what we should now consider a mere "fancy" or conceit was to the dramatist of that age the appropriate expression of the highest imaginative thought.

The last paper of the session was that of Professor Alcée Fortier of Tulane University,

La., upon "Bits of Louisiana Folk-lore." This proved one of the most entertaining papers of the session, and it was a matter of regret that the limited time prevented anything except the more popular presentation of the subject.

In the evening the members of the association were tendered a reception by the Historical Society at its rooms. The reception brought together a large and distinguished gathering, and conversation was general and animated.

The last day's session was opened by Professor Charles F. Kroeh with a paper on the "Methods of Teaching Modern Languages," in which he advocated the "natural method."

The Convention now proceeded to the more technical papers. The "Speech Unities and their Rôle in Sound Change and Phonetic Laws" by Professor Gustaf Karsten and "Die Herkunft der sogenannten Schwachen Verba der germanischen Sprachen" by Professor Hermann Collitz were both delivered in German and led to considerable discussion. Professor E. S. Sheldon, of Harvard University, followed with an interesting paper on "Some Specimens of a Canadian French Dialect spoken in Maine," which elicited from Professor Elliott the identification of many of its peculiarities with those of the dialects of Northern France. The last paper of the morning session, "On Paul's Principien der Sprachgeschichte," by Dr. Julius Goebel of Johns Hopkins University, dealt largely with metaphysical theories of the origin of language and brought out an extremely lively discussion between its author and Professor Karsten.

After midday luncheon, before the reading of papers was resumed, the reports of committees were in order. Among them was that of the committee appointed to memorialize Congress for a removal of the tax upon foreign books. Resolutions also were received and approved embodying the thanks of the association to the University of Pennsylvania and to the various organizations that had extended their courtesy to the members of the association.

The next paper, "A Study of Lord Macaulay's English" by President Henry E. Shepherd of the College of Charleston, called out the expression of so much opinion adverse to the

great English essayist, that it may well be doubted if anything short of Macaulay's own impetuous eloquence could have stemmed the tide of disapproval. Professor Hart found no pleasure or profit in him; Professor Hunt had never received from him the least intellectual stimulus; and finally another gentleman stepped in with the *coup de grâce* by stating that he owed much to Macaulay as an author who had taught him the want of something better in the way of mental pabulum.

Professor Albert H. Smyth of Philadelphia then read an essay on "American Literature in the Class-room," putting in a strong plea for the more general recognition of our own authors in our school and college curricula. In reply to the position there taken, Professor Wood made an excellent point, by calling attention to the greater justice of the term 'English Literature in America' in comparison with the term 'American Literature.'

In his paper on "The English Curriculum in the University," Dr. James W. Bright of Johns Hopkins dwelt upon the true distinction between the university and the college, and excited much favorable discussion. The exercises were brought to a close with a paper on "The Earliest Works on Italian Grammar and Lexicography published in England," by Prof. A. Marshall Elliott of Johns Hopkins University.

In the evening, the members of the Association met many of their newly-made friends at the Penn Club's Reception, which concluded the list of hospitalities.

The varied character of the papers read calls for some comment. The considerable number and excellence of the papers dealing more or less with pedagogics, can not but be regarded as the indication of an awakening upon a subject too long neglected among us; while the literary tendency of others indicates that we are not, at least not all of us, given over hopelessly to *die neue Philologie*. The philological depths were sounded in the purely technical papers, but the fact that philology is none the less concerned with living and growing organism was recognized as perhaps it has never before been recognized here in America. In the excellent work of Professors Primer, Sheldon and Fortier, in their representation of the

living speech phenomena around us—as was justly said during the convention—we must recognize what seems to be the peculiar function of this Association. It is to be hoped that such work may inspire renewed effort for the future in this interesting field of research.

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

• CONVENTION OF THE
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
OF ONTARIO.

The Second Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association of Ontario, Canada, was held in the Canadian Institute, Toronto, on Wednesday and Thursday, December 28th and 29th.

The attendance of members was large and included the names of most of the best known and most successful teachers of French and German in the Province. Upon a survey of the topics treated, it will be seen that though the subjects had a wide range, they yet bore almost exclusively upon what the teacher might directly utilize in his work in the classroom. The seemingly practical bent thus given to the discussions of the Convention was due to the fact that its members were with few exceptions language teachers in Secondary Schools. We may remark that there are in Ontario over one hundred of these so-called High Schools; that in each of them provision has to be made for the teaching not only of the classics but also of one at least of the modern languages; and that in all the larger schools special masters are employed for this purpose.

The opening address of the convention was given by its Hon. Prest., Dr. Daniel Wilson, the venerable President of Toronto University. The topic treated of was "The Influence of the French Revolution on English Literature." The great English poets who flourished in the brilliant literary epoch marked by the latter part of the reign of the Third George, were named and briefly characterized; and it was shown what was the influence exerted by the political events in France on their lives and writings.

In the afternoon session of Wednesday, papers were read on "English Metre," on "The Natural Method of Teaching Languages," and on "Language and Thought."

At the evening meeting, Mr. Vandersmissen, the President, opened with an address on "History and Literature," the speaker limiting himself to the field of Germany. A paper was then read on "The Study of English in Ontario." In the animated discussion which followed on this subject, the majority of the speakers held, with the writer of the article, that English is well taught in the Ontario High Schools. Another subject treated of was that of Text-Books, of which it was pleaded that a periodical revision should be made, every five years, by a competent committee.

On the following morning, after the election of officers and of new members, a resolution was passed asking the Modern Language Masters of the Province to send in the names of works in French and German suitable for University Matriculation examination.

The reading of papers was then resumed. The first subject discussed was that of "The Eye and the Ear in Modern Language Teaching." These two organs, it was held, should be cultivated simultaneously, as should also the ear and the voice. A plea was also advanced for the application in teaching of the principles of phonetics. The Convention closed with a practical paper on "Translating French."

We heartily congratulate our fellow teachers across the border-line on the success of their recent meeting, and trust that their efforts in the direction of improved teaching of Modern Languages, and of a more thorough study of the same, may meet with even greater success in the future.

JOHN R. WIGHTMAN.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRECTIONS TO WHITNEY'S
FRENCH VOCABULARIES.

A careful perusal of the vocabularies at the close of Whitney's 'Practical French Grammar,' suggests the following corrections:

I.—FRENCH-ENGLISH VOCABULARY.

Après-midi is given as masc.,—better fem.;—*auberge* masc., should be fem.;—*chanson*, masc., should be fem.;—*côté*, fem., should be masc. (As this mistake occurs also in the English-French vocabulary, and as the author derives the word from the form *costa*, 'rib,' it is probable that the error is not a typographical one merely, but due perhaps to a confusion with *côte*.)—*Faim*, masc., should be fem.;—*tortueux* is marked as fem. (with no designation as adj.).—Under head of omission, we may note that the word *cerise*, used on page 97 (sentence 19), is wanting in the vocabulary.

2.—ENGLISH-FRENCH VOCABULARY.

Under the word 'afternoon,' *après-midi*, masc.,—better fem.;—under the words 'many' and 'too' the author gives, as one meaning for 'too many,' the expression *trop beaucoup de* (!) (This error is corrected in the abridged edition.)—Under the word 'March,' the gender of the French *mars* should be given, (same remark for *peuple*, under the word 'people').—Under the word 'perhaps,' *peut être* should be joined by a hyphen;—under the word 'side,' *côté*, fem., should be masc.

If the question of etymologies were to be touched upon, attention might be called to the inconsistency between examples like: *laurier* [fr. L. *laurum*], *orage* [fr. L. *aura*, breeze], etc., on the one hand, and those more accurately given, such as: *berger* [LL. *berbicum*, fr. *berbex*, ram], *fromage* [formaticum, shaped], on the other.

B. L. BOWEN.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of Modern Language Notes:

I have had for some years an old dictionary which has afforded me considerable amusement, and I think a few extracts from it may be of interest to your readers. The work is entitled: "A New and Complete American Dictionary of the English and German Languages," By Wm. Odell Elwell (New York, 1852). The significance of the word "American" in this title will appear in what follows.

Some time ago, in looking it over, I came upon the expression "catawamptiously chawed up," which I found translated as "gänzlich zerstört, ganz und gar vernichtet." This discovery encouraged me to look further, and I append the result of my investigations in the following list of choice excerpts:

ABSQUATULATE. Weglaufen.

ARGUFY. Gewicht haben: beweisen.

BLACKSTRAP. Brantwein und Zucker: Grog.

BOGUS. Eine Art Grog.

BUSTER. Etwas Grosses, Colossales, Ungeheures.

CALIBOGUS. Ein Getränk von Rum und Bier.

DIGGINGS. Der Bezirk.

DINGED. Sehr.

DRATTED. Sehr: ausserordentlich.

FARZINER (!). (Corruptirt aus 'Far as I Know.').
So viel ich weiss.

FLUMMUX. Verwirren.

GAL-BOY. Ein wildes Mädchen.

KÖOL-SLÄA. Der Kohlsalat.

LAM. Derb durchprügeln.

PESKY. Gross: weit: ausserordentlich; in hohem Grade: sehr.

RANTANKEROUS. Zänkisch.

SNOOZER. Der Dieb (in Gasthöfen).

SPOONEY. Der einf. ltige Mensch.

This list might be extended indefinitely. The German's conception of "English as She is Spoke" in America is quite as mirth-provoking as that of the Portuguese grammarian whose little book gave him fame of a sort altogether unexpected.

WILLIAM MORTON PAYNE.

Chicago High School.

NOCH EINMAL MEISSNER-JOYNES;
II.

§ 403 ff. Das Capitel über die Verwandtschaft der englischen Sprache mit der deutschen hätte auf der Grundlage von Grimm's Verschiebungsgesetz zu einem recht fruchtbaren gemacht werden können; aber leider ist die Behandlung dieses Gegenstandes gerade in den Hauptpunkten unklar und fehlerhaft. Es wird nirgends angegeben INWIEFERN ein grosser Teil der Unterschiede zwischen den beiden Sprachen durch Grimm's Gesetz zu

erklären ist; im Gegenteil, §§405 & 414 müssen in jedem Uneingeweihten die verkehrte Vorstellung erwecken, als ob jenes Gesetz nur für die Zeit vor der Lostrennung des Angelsächsischen von dem Stammlande in Betracht käme; ein Vergleich der einander entsprechenden deutschen und englischen Laute mit dem Schema S. 221 nötigt ferner zu dem Schlusse, dass die englischen Consonanten durchweg einer späteren Entwicklungsstufe angehören, als die deutschen. Sieht man vollends, wie die englischen Formen den deutschen überall nachgestellt sind, und wie §411 von Auslassungen, Einfügungen und Umstellungen handelt, so ergibt sich als scheinbar zweifellos, dass der engl. Consonantismus sich aus dem hochdeutschen entwickelt habe. So wird der arglose Neuling von vornherein in die Irre geführt. Fast möchte es scheinen, als ob der Bearbeiter selbst nicht ganz im Klaren gewesen wäre; denn in dem erwähnten Schema S. 221 ist Grimm's Verschiebungsgesetz in ganz entstellter Form wiedergegeben. Die Reihenfolge sollte sein

Soft—Hard—Aspirate (—Soft).

und S. 222:

English—soft — hard — aspirate—
German—hard—aspirate—soft.

Es würde sich empfehlen, wie hier, so überall die englischen Formen den deutschen voranzustellen und den Grund dafür—die Priorität der englischen consonantischen Lautstufe im Vergleich mit der weiter verschobenen hochdeutschen—ausdrücklich zu erklären und hervorzuheben.—§§ 409, 410. Die Einteilung der lautlichen Abweichungen ist manchmal sogar für ein Elementarbuch zu unwissenschaftlich.—§ 414. *Overset* ein *primitive*?—§ 417. *Zu Stande kommen*=*to be brought about, to be consummated*.—§ 422. *Ehrenbezeugungen*, nicht *bezeichnungen*.—§ 423. *Die Hose, das Beinkleid* sind ganz gewöhnlich als Singulare; auch *das Ostern, das (die) Pfingsten, das (die) Weihnachten* oder *die Weihnacht, die Alp* kommen häufig vor.—§ 425. Die Bemerkung: *but in the compound, die Fensterladen, only*—ist unrichtig.—§ 426. *Der Chor*=*the chorus, the choir*; *das Chor*=*the choir*.—§ 428. (*or dem Herrn*) ist zu streichen; *die Frau Professor(in); meine Frau* wird nie als Anrede gebraucht, man sagt *Madam(e)*

(veraltet) oder höflicher *gnädige Frau*, oder aber *Frau* mit nachfolgendem Namen resp. Titel des Gemahls: *Frau Müller, Frau Doctor(in)* etc.—§ 430^e. Selten *dies(es) mein Herz*.—§ 432. *Die Buchdruckerkunst* wörtlich *the art-of-the-printer-of-books*.—§ 434^c. Füge hinzu: *sich entsinnen, to remember*.—§ 437.6. *Sich anmassen, to arrogate*; Note: der Gebrauch des Artikels wäre unhöflich, da derselbe vor Eigennamen oft Geringschätzung ausdrückt.—§ 438. Ist *favorable* im Sinne des deutschen *hold* guter Sprachgebrauch? Siehe Ex. LI, Satz 1.—§ 450. *Allerliebste* ist kein absoluter, sondern ein relativer Superlativ (*aller*=*von allen*); aber es wird jetzt kaum mehr als Superlativ gefühlt, das beweist seine praedictive Anwendung und der regelmässige Gebrauch des unbestimmten Artikels vor demselben.—§ 452. In *meinetwegen, seinetwillen, euerthalben* etc. haben wir nicht Genitive der Personalia, sondern Accusative resp. Dative der Possessiva, da *wegen, willen, halben* ursprünglich substantivische Casus sind. Also eigentlich (und früher thatsächlich so geschrieben) *von meinen Wegen, um seinen Willen, (von) eueren Halben* (mhd. *halbe*=Seite, Richtung). Wegen des *t* vergleiche man die Formen *meinetwegen, derentwillen, allenthalben* etc. Mit Ausnahme von *halb(en)*, das schon ganz früh als blosser Praeposition auftritt, ist der gen. sing. der Personalia in Verbindung mit diesen Ausdrücken erst neuerdings, und nur in beschränktem Masse, gebräuchlich geworden.—§ 457.3 sollte lauten: Regularly, as *indefinite* antecedent of a relative, *he (who) is derjenige—or der—not er, etc.: he who is happy, derjenige welcher glücklich ist, or wer glücklich ist*; but when the antecedent refers to a certain person before mentioned or understood, it must be translated by the personal pronoun: *auch er (sie, etc.), der (die, etc.) mir so viel verdankte, verliess mich in der Not*.—§ 459, Remark. Darin dürfte man mit dem Bearbeiter doch nicht ohne Weiteres übereinstimmen. Dasselbe gilt von der Bemerkung § 462,2.—§ 463,b.—*continuing up to and during the present time*.—§ 467. *Mich bezahlen*, nicht *mir*; aber wenn das Ding, welches bezahlt wird, erwähnt ist, steht es im Accusativ, die Person, der man etwas bezahlt, im Dativ.—§ 468. *Um dass* ist veraltet.—§ 472.

He might have forgotten it würde man zurückübersetzen mit *er hätte es vergessen können*, nicht *er dürfte* etc. *Dürfen* drückt eher eine Wahrscheinlichkeit, als eine bloße Möglichkeit aus; dazu hat der Conj. Praet. *dürfte* fast immer Praesensbedeutung. Also *das dürfte zu schwer sein: that is probably too hard*; *er dürfte es vergessen haben: he has probably forgotten it*, etc.—§ 474,d. Nach *fühlen, hören, sehen* ist der active Infinitiv mindestens doppelsinnig; man wird ihn stets eher activ als passiv auffassen.—§ 477, Note. *Den Fluss durchschwamm*, nicht *d. F. schwamm*. c. Sätze wie der letzte (mit *um dass*) dürfen dem Schüler nicht als Muster vorgelegt werden.—§ 483. *Erbittert* heisst *exasperated*; *embittered*=*verbittert*.—§ 485. *Ja, hören sie einmal* kann je nach der Betonung auf ganz verschiedene Weise übersetzt werden, aber keinesfalls mit *just listen to what I say*; am nächsten käme wol, dem Sinne nach, ein Ausdruck wie: *But, my dear Sir*, etc. *Ja* als Ausrufungswort zu Anfang eines Satzes entspricht dem englischen *Yes* mit angehängtem *that is (would be) all very well* und drückt meist Ungeduld aus. *Hören Sie (einmal)!* ist eine Anrufung wie das englische (*I*) *say!* *Kommt er noch nicht* heisst *is he not coming yet?* *Wohl*, bedeutet *probably*, nicht *may-be*, manchmal auch *indeed*: *Das ist wol wahr, that is indeed true*, oder *that is true enough*.—§ 486,1b. Wenn der Hauptsatz mit *so* beginnt, heisst das *wenn* im Nebensatz stets *if*; so ist es auch in den letzten zwei Beispielen zu übersetzen.—§ 487, Examples 1a. Nach *versteckte* etc. lies *who was ... and who received and concealed* etc.—

Die Uebungsstücke zum Uebersetzen verlieren dadurch sehr an Wert, dass die allzu reichlichen Anmerkungen dem Schüler oft gar keine Gelegenheit zur selbständigen Anwendung gelernter Regeln übrig lassen. Wozu sollen denn solche Uebersetzungen dienen, wenn z. B. überall angegeben wird, wann der Conjunctiv gebraucht werden muss und wie das Verbalnomen auf *ing* wiederzugeben ist? Anderswo wird in ganz leichten Dingen nachgeholfen, während idiomatische Eigentümlichkeiten, die sich keiner Regel fügen (wie S. 303 *a little way*, S. 311 *the snows of Lapland*, etc.) unerklärt bleiben. Auch sonst finden sich

einige Versehen.—p 303, Ex. IV. Wozu ist *lying* in Klammern?—p 304, Ex. VII. *To restrain* ist hier: *in Schranken (im Zaume) halten*.—p 306, Ex. X. Anm. 1 ist für den Schüler zu unbestimmt.—p. 310 Ex. VIII. *To redeem*, hier: *sühnen*; *to disdain*: *verschmähen*; Anm. 9 soll wol heissen *anhängen*, aber auch dieses Wort passt hier nicht, vielmehr sollte die ganze, für den Schüler zu schwierige Stelle (*he bis ignominy*) in einer Anmerkung erklärt sein. Ex. IX. *Tend exceedingly: sind sehr dazu angethan*; *gehen sehr weit* wäre hier undeutsch.—§ 311. *To delight in: seine Freude (Lust) haben an*.

Zur Liste der starken Verba: *Fechten* und *flechten* sollen auch schwach vorkommen? Von *beklemmen* ist nur das Part. Perf. *bekommen* stark. *Klingen* ist immer stark. Das Part. Perf. von *stecken* wird stets schwach gebildet.

Endlich sind die folgenden Druckfehler zu verzeichnen:—§ 134. (§ 87) statt (§ 86).—§ 206. (§ 456,2.) st. (§ 455,2.).—§ 427. *Matthei* st. *Matthäi*.—§ 434,c. *ged* st. *get*.—§ 437,5. *forbode* st. *forebode*.—§ 462. *advatage* st. *advantage*.—§ 475,d. *under* (1) st. *in* § 474.—§ 485,10. *Das ist wahr* st. *Das ist wohl wahr*.—§ 303, Ex. III. *gone*³ st. *gone*.—§ 308, Ex. V. *mouth*⁷ st. *mouth*.—§ 317. 231 b (vor *schinden*) st. 231 a.

Nach so vielen Ausstellungen gereicht es dem Referenten zur Freude, auch der unterschiedlichen Vorzüge zu gedenken, welche die amerikanische Bearbeitung vor ihrem englischen Original auszeichnen und die dazu beitragen werden, dem Buche in einer verbesserten Auflage einen Platz unter den besten vorhandenen Schulgrammatiken zu sichern.

HUGO SCHILLING.

Wittenberg College.

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.

After two such reviews of the Joynes-Meissner German Grammar as have appeared in the NOTES—with more promised of like kind—surely even a book as limited in its scope and as modest in its pretensions as this declares itself to be, must have some right of defense. That I fully share Mr. Schilling's wish that the book in a future edition may be made as free

as possible from error, is proved by the fact that he had been specially asked to communicate to the editor his suggestions to that end and, also, that at my request the publishers have since addressed a like printed invitation to all teachers known to be using the book. I accept this as the avowed object of his paper—in spite of some, doubtless unconscious, features hardly consistent with this single purpose; and I thank him for whatever corrections he may have made. Yet I cannot but regret, for his own sake as well as mine and the book's, that he did not subject his work to more careful revision. This—not in deprecation of criticism, but in sheer justice—I now propose to do. I shall follow his "points" one by one—so far at least as may suffice for the present purpose; then I shall add a few words of conclusion.

1. § 96. It is an error to say that I divide nouns of the weak declension into not less than six groups. I appeal to the text and the context (§§ 93, 94)
2. § 134. The statement that the combined endings of the pronominal and of the adjective should be learned "both horizontally and vertically" occurs, in smaller type, in one of those *suggestions to teachers*, referred to in the preface, of which nothing more will now be said. That they should be so learned "auswendig" is a gratuitous addition.
3. § 408. The *mnemonic words*, referring to Grimm's Law, are taken, with slight change from the Historical English Grammar of Dr. R. Morris, by whom they are expressly attributed to his friend, the Rev. W. W. Skeat—a surely sufficient authority. They are here expressly intended only as a help for beginners.
4. § 244, etc. The fact that the *Indefinites* are divided, in a first statement, into *pronouns* and *adjectives*;—that, later, some of the latter are included under the general term *pronominals* (with reference to the declension of a following adjective)—and that, finally (under syntax), the entire group is treated in detail as *indefinites*, is perfectly simple, consistent, and logical. The same might be said of the demonstratives, etc.
5. § 481, 2. What is said of the perfect participles of intransitive verbs is a simple statement of the truth. It would not be true to say that such participles have here *active* meaning. *Das gesunkene Schiff* does not mean a *ship that has sunk something else*.
6. § 28. Is the reverse of "apodiktisch." The reference to the "best authorities" clearly implies that there are other authorities and other usage. That I have correctly stated the *best usage* will, I presume, not be denied.
7. Pp. 17-18. That the *Schrift* letters, here copied from Meissner, are not perfect, may be admitted; but many teachers think a fair handwriting makes a better copy than a perfect copper-plate. The microscopic accuracy of the criticism is, however, only suggestive of frequent regret elsewhere.
8. § 85. It would be impossible to believe, *without referring to the text*, that it is nowhere stated that such words as *Jüngling, Heft, Pferd*, etc., are not unlauted in the plural! They occur only in some groups of words given as exercises in the paradigms—and there, without the least reflection on the "Geistesgaben der Amerikanischen Jugend!"
9. § 86. Here *might* be added *mancher* and *solcher*; but they come in better elsewhere.
10. § 88. Might also stand after § 79; but is in its proper place here. *Ihr* "her," here indeed "forgotten," is duly remembered, § 192.
11. § 101. The book gives both forms for *Schmerz*.
12. § 105 is a side remark, in smaller type, calling attention to the occasional occurrence of unusual, or double forms. In so far, it is entirely correct and in place.
13. § 123. Does not *Augapfel* also mean the "pupil of the eye?"
14. § 132. It would not have been in place to distinguish *here* the plurals *Tücher* and *Tuche*. Such double forms are discussed later.
15. § 175. The forms *habe er*, etc., instead of *er habe*, etc., are given (for imperatives) because they are the more usual forms—as

is stated in the immediate context—(§ 177), and also, more fully and precisely, § 346.

16. § 202, 3. Yes; the statement is too general. "Often" or "usually" should be inserted. Thanks.
17. It is a mistake to say that § 235 "besagt dasselbe wie § 234." See the text.
18. But by far the gravest of all is Mr. Schilling's criticism upon the verb-forms, § 242, 243, 232, 246, which for convenience may be grouped together.—He here charges error, or defect, in not less than 28 of the Strong Verbs—surely a serious charge and deserving, if true, of even severer remark—but can it be possible that so grave a charge could be made if not true? Let us see.

Of these twenty-eight forms, two, *fichst*, *flichtst* (for *fichtst*, *flichtst*) occur in the last edition of Meissner, and are not included in the list of misprints kindly sent me by Dr. M.; nor were they noted by any of my accomplished proof-readers. Still, they may be erroneous.

For one, *birst* (for *birstest*) I do not find the requisite authority, though it may exist.

And now, will it be believed that the other 25 forms are given in the grammar with entire correctness, almost in the very terms demanded by Mr. Schilling? And yet this astonishing statement is true! I need only refer to the Alphabetical List, pp. 312-320—a list not included in Meissner's Grammar, but made by me as expressly supplementary to the classified lists (intended for earliest exercise only) from which alone Mr. S. has quoted. This, too, from a critic who, in his very first sentence declares that the relation of my work to Dr. Meissner's has been "festgestellt"—strange coincidence!—by another critic (Dr. Goebel) who, in an express list of "improvements," does not mention this most important addition!!

Can it be possible that Mr. Schilling had not seen this list, but deliberately set himself to review a book which he had not even read through? Is this the *deutsche Gründlichkeit* of which we hear so much?—Is this what was due to the MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES? or to me? or to himself?

Need I go further? Need I pursue to the end this list of "Punkte," of which there is just one column more—mostly, like the preceding, either mistaken or trivial—to show the essential (yet I would not say, intentional) injustice of this review? That Mr. Schilling has contributed a few useful corrections, I thankfully acknowledge; but I should be too vain if I imagined the book did not need more careful reading and more helpful criticism than his. These, with the aid of all willing friends, I promise to supply, for the next edition.

Now, having so far followed Mr. Schilling's order, I will venture, in a few concluding remarks, to move backwards. The *Veraltete Formen, Verstösse gegen das Idiom*, etc., to which he refers, I hope Mr. S. will not fail to communicate, either through the NOTES or personally. But it is only fair to add that, at different stages, the sheets of this book were read by scholars familiar with the best "Sprachgebrauch" in both German and English. The errors which have escaped them all are, I trust, neither many nor serious. Still, they will be gratefully corrected.

As to the opinion that the detailed exhibition of the paradigms, in an elementary book, necessarily demands "das geistestötende Auswendiglernen" I have no reply to make. So far as the remark is meant to apply to the supposed methods of the editor of this book, it is an entire mistake. At the same time, I do deem it proper that the student, or the teacher, who needs to consult a paradigm, should know where to find it, in its most complete form.

Still moving backwards, I read the first sentence, wherein, with sincere regret, I note the starting-point of this review, in an error so grave that it could hardly have failed to lead the writer astray. That Dr. Goebel, in his paper for December, had "im Allgemeinen festgestellt" the relation of my work to Dr. Meissner's original, is, unfortunately, not true. Mr. Schilling's opinion to that effect is, I fear, only an instance of misplaced confidence! Only my respect for Dr. Meissner and for his work has prevented and still prevents me from pursuing this question in detail; but I leave its answer to every candid reader who will

compare the two books. That Dr. Goebel had "gezeichnet" the character of Prof. Harrison's paper (for November) may be true—but the terms in which he did so are certainly to be regretted by every "Fachgenosse."

Finally—and with most regret—I observe that Mr. Schilling's indebtedness to Dr. Goebel begins even before the first sentence, with the title itself: "*Noch Einmal Meissner-Joynes*." The book in question is named by its American proprietors, who have amply satisfied all other rights, the *Joynes-Meissner German Grammar*. This title was intended to represent the nature of the book, which is, moreover, fully and fairly stated on the title-page and in the preface Mr. Schilling, following Dr. Goebel, calls it *Meissner-Joynes*—with what purpose, jocose or serious, I will not pretend to say. But, I submit, this is not even lawful; still less is it courteous; least of all is it worthy of a dignified review. Let me suppose a case: if Mr. Schilling had, for any reasons, subscribed his review with the signature *Schilling-Goebel* would he have deemed it courteous or legitimate in me to quote it by the name *Goebel-Schilling*? Yet just so—only in a far graver matter—have he and Dr. Goebel treated the title of the *Joynes-Meissner German Grammar*.

EDWARD S. JOYNES.

South Carolina College.

P. S.—The editors of the NOTES have been kind enough to send me the proofs of Mr. Schilling's "*Noch Einmal Meissner-Joynes II*," against which I have hardly anything to object, except—as before—the title, for which I hardly hold Mr. S. responsible. I note with pleasure the absence of that *tone*—apparent but, I am sure, unconscious—which was so much regretted in the first paper. I am thankful for many helpful criticisms, while—as before—some, on closer inspection, would appear to be mistaken and others quite unimportant. I have even "heaped a little fire" on Mr. Schilling's head, by correcting some false references and misprints that he had overlooked in his own paper. As to the errors in *German*, it would be amusing to see how far—almost without exception—they are taken without change from Meissner, an "*Eingeborener*;" but this, of course, did not fall within the scope of Mr. Schilling's review, and would be, moreover, no excuse for actual error. I shall thankfully accept his help in a closer inspection of all such points for the next edition.

The only point of Mr. Schilling's second paper that I care to notice, is his criticism upon the chapter on the Relation of German to English, with reference to the brief statement of (or rather, allusion to) Grimm's Law. If he will read more carefully, he will see that I speak only of correspondence *between* the two languages—not of derivation, nor even change, from one to the other. Historical views are expressly excluded (both here and in the preface). Now, the reason for putting the German first was purely *pedagogical*: that is, the German form is considered as the pupil's *datum*, to be correlated with its corresponding English. In certain cases—as in the latter part of my reply to Mr. Schilling's first paper—it may be lawful to *move backwards*. At the same time, I am quite willing to admit—as suggested to me by another very kind critic [Prof. BRANDT]—that it might have been better for my (elementary) purpose to give simply a list of principal correspondences, without any reference to Grimm's Law. At any rate, there is "not enough of this to hurt;" and the limits of the view presented are very clearly stated in the book.

In conclusion, let me again thank Mr. Schilling for the trouble he has taken, with the promise that not one of his suggestions shall be disregarded in the revision of a book of which—with all its faults—he is good enough to speak so kindly.

E. S. J.

Quatre grands poètes du 19^e siècle, Conférences, par ALCÉE FORTIER, professeur à l'Université de Tulane, N. Orléans, 1887.

Ce petit volume nous a intéressé; encore que publié en Louisiane, où la langue française n'est pas morte, Dieu merci, il pourrait bien être, sous son apparence modeste, un signe des temps. Il faut bien qu'on se dise, en effet, que le couronnement des études littéraires est nécessairement polyglotte, et que, pour achever une vue d'ensemble sur la pensée d'un peuple, la langue qui lui servit à l'exprimer est le seul instrument propre à en faire comprendre la portée et les nuances avec fidélité. C'est assez dire que nous voudrions voir l'usage des conférences françaises se multiplier dans les universités américaines, non seulement pour exposer les sujets littéraires aux étudiants des degrés supérieurs, mais encore pour façonner leur oreille aux modulations de la langue et de la parole françaises.

Rien ne vaut l'anglais pour parler de Shakespeare, l'allemand, pour analyser Goethe, et,

pour disserter sur Musset ou sur Lamartine, l'idiome sonore et précis qui fit vibrer leur lyre.

Au point de vue de l'histoire littéraire, les conférences de M. Fortier sont complètes,—trop complètes même, à notre gré,—car il nous paraît impossible de traiter d'aussi vastes sujets dans un cadre aussi restreint, si l'on prétend tout dire. Le catalogue des œuvres prend tant de place, qu'il n'en reste guère pour les appréciations originales. Or, comme M. P. Bourget le dit si justement, l'extrême civilisation tend à remplacer la faculté de créer par celle de comprendre, et nous vivons dans un siècle où l'enseignement littéraire ne saurait aller sans analyse. On saisit bien que nous ne parlons pas ici de l'analyse d'un roman ou d'un conte,—M. Fortier, selon nous, use un peu trop de celle-là,—mais de cette analyse esthétique et psychologique, qui, sous l'émotion donnée, cherche sa raison d'être. Nous croyons fermement que quelques morceaux soigneusement choisis, étudiés à la lumière d'une critique personnelle, donnent d'un auteur une idée plus féconde que l'énumération de ses ouvrages.

Mais ce n'est là qu'un point de vue, et il est bien possible que l'auteur des "Quatre conférences" ne le partage pas. Cette divergence d'opinion ne nous empêche point de rendre hommage à l'érudition de M. Fortier, qui, dans ces consciencieuses études, a ouvert une voie où nous voudrions voir d'autres s'engager après lui.

Et puis, il faut le dire, dans l'idée de l'auteur, ses conférences étaient, peut-être, plutôt des leçons qu'autre chose; il parlait à ses étudiants, plus encore qu'à un public déjà lettré, partant, plus exigeant.—Si c'était le cas, et nous avons lieu de le croire, les réserves que nous avons faites perdraient beaucoup de leur force, et pourraient bien se transformer en éloges,—car le volume dont nous parlons s'adapte admirablement à cet enseignement, nécessairement plus dogmatique que critique, qui reste la base indispensable de l'esthétique littéraire, logiquement postérieure en date.—A ce point de vue, le livre de Mr. Fortier est un manuel précieux à consulter, dont la place nous paraît marquée, d'avance, dans les bibliothèques "collégiales" et universitaires.

Un mot, toutefois: Mr. Fortier, en prenant (pages 38 et 39) la *défense* de Lamartine,

.....qui n'avait m rit',
Ni cet exc s d'honneur, ni cette indignit',

lui a-t-il fait sa véritable place? A-t-il tenu suffisamment compte de cette justice tardive, mais éclatante, que la critique contemporaine rend à l'auteur des *Méditations*?—Il n'est, peut-être, pas hors de propos de rappeler ici que Mr. Brunetière disait de lui (R. des D. M., Août, 1886): "J'ai la confiance que l'heure viendra, tôt ou tard, pour Lamartine, d'être mis à son rang, et ce rang.....il se pourrait que ce fût le premier."

Entendez-vous? Le *premier*, et celà, dans le siècle qu'on appelle déjà, un peu prématurément peut-être, le siècle de V. Hugo!—Et Mr. Brunetière n'est pas le seul, puisque T. Lemaître s'écrit: "Et notez que Lamartine, c'est plus qu'un poète, c'est la poésie elle-même." (V. *Les Contemporains*, 1^{re} Série, à propos de F. Coppée).

Chose qui donne, assurément, à penser, que cet accord absolu sur le nom de Lamartine, entre deux critiques éminents, de méthodes si diverses, l'un, gardien jaloux des traditions classiques, l'autre, si franchement épris de modernité.....

A. DU FOUR.

Washington, D. C.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

A History of Elizabethan Literature. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY. Macmillan & Co., London and New York, 1887. XIV, 471 pp. 8vo.

We have read this book with genuine pleasure and satisfaction. It grows in interest as it expands, and is laid aside with a feeling of regret and grateful recollection. Mr. Saintsbury's previous training in our own literature, his wide and varied acquaintance with the literature of France, eminently qualify him to be the historian of the most fascinating and comprehensive era in the development of our language. Such the Elizabethan age is; such it must always be. Its position in our literary evolution is similar to that of Rome in the evolution of European history: it is the central

point; all previous literature converges to it, all subsequent literature diverges from it. The wonderful complexity of influences that entered into its development has never been adequately investigated; the harvest for special research is still rich and plenteous. We can in the course of an ordinary review note only the distinctive features of Mr. Saintsbury's work. The preliminary portion is executed with the characteristic thoroughness of the author; we are especially pleased with the lucid fashion in which he has explained the genesis of the Elizabethan drama, with its commingling of scholarly and popular, classical and romantic elements. Ample justice is done almost for the first time, if we except Professor Minto's sketch in his 'Characteristics of English Poets,' to the strange and isolated genius of Sackville, the author of the 'Induction to "The Mirror for Magistrates."' We seem in this unique production to reap for the first time the ripe fruits of the Renaissance in England; with no disparagement of the earlier school of Surrey and Wyatt, nothing in the range of our literature had approached the 'Induction' in sombre splendor and melancholy grace. The opening stanzas never fail to recall the introduction to Keats's 'Eve of St. Agnes,' the style of which must have been sensibly affected by its diligent study. We adhere to the opinion previously expressed, that Mr. Saintsbury in tracing the origin of our prose literature does not carry his investigations to a sufficiently early period in the history of our speech, ignoring the first Biblical translation in which the form and fashion of our sacred style was fixed for all time. The omission is the more conspicuous by reason of the superb tribute he pays to the King James or Authorized Version, itself the consummate flower of many preceding translations and much heroic devotion. Notably is this true of Tyndale, whose undefiled English has kindled the enthusiastic admiration of the cold and cavilling Froude.

We believe that no previous historian of this epoch has so thoroughly succeeded in portraying its complex and versatile richness of thought as well as form and color. An anthology of the minor and almost forgotten poets of the Elizabethan age, would form a

most valuable contribution to our literature. In no era of the world's literature, perhaps, is there so much that is rare and worthy of survival which has so nearly faded from the memory of after times. The specific influence of the Renaissance in developing in our literature a love of form and color, is discussed by Mr. Saintsbury in his wonted stimulating and suggestive manner. It has sometimes been the fashion of literary historians to speak of the "highly colored style now regnant in our poetry," as if it were of modern origin, being coincident with Keats and Shelley, and perpetuated by Tennyson in our own time. Such a view seems to be entirely at variance with the recognized facts of our literary development. The poetry of the Elizabethan age teems with richness of coloring and splendor of form; not only the master-pieces of its supreme artists, Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Johnson, but the writings of many almost nameless bards abound in flashes of brilliancy and beauty aglow with the very genius of the Renaissance. However much this feature of Elizabethan times may have been repressed during the critical or reflective dispensation of Dryden and Pope, it beamed forth again under the more auspicious influences of our romantic revival during the closing decades of the eighteenth and the earlier decades of the nineteenth century. We regret that time and adherence to rational limits will not allow us to consider Mr. Saintsbury's view of the strange phenomenon known as Euphuism, and his admirable pages upon the great prose-poets, Taylor, Milton, and Sir Thomas Browne.

If we were to venture a criticism upon Mr. Saintsbury's English, it would assume the form of a gentle protest against the superabundant employment of "the enemy 'and which,'" to quote his own language in the introduction to his *English Prose*, p. xxxiii. The phrase is a harsh and dissonant one even when "preceded by another which;" for the most part its use can be dispensed with with pleasure to the reader, as well as with advantage to the grace and symmetry of the sentence.

A brief review can convey no adequate impression of the value of Mr. Saintsbury's work.

While not acquiescing in all his views and deploring an occasional looseness of expression, we cordially commend the book to the critical scrutiny of students of English Literature in the United States.

H. E. SHEPHERD.

College of Charleston.

Ueber die Sprache der Wandalen. Ein Beitrag zur Germanischen Namen- und Dialectforschung von DR. FERDINAND WREDE. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner, 1886.

Wer die Entwicklung der deutschen Philologie während des letzten Jahrzehnts aufmerksam und unbefangen verfolgt hat, dem wird es wol nicht ohne Bedauern entgangen sein, wie diese Wissenschaft nach und nach zur einseitigen Lautforschung zusammengeschrumpft ist. Dass es bei der herrschenden Mode ein Leichtes sei, sich durch Aneignung beliebiger Schlagwörter, Schulausdrücke und Formeln einen wissenschaftlichen Namen zu erwerben, hat schon Scherer scharf gerügt. Von dem Geiste, der die grossen Begründer der germanistischen Studien und ihre nächsten Schüler beseelte, schien sich nur wenig auf die Epigonen vererbt zu haben, die ihre Grösse gar oft damit zu beweisen suchten, dass sie über jene Männer hochmütig herfahren. Ein jeder Versuch die Mode zu durchbrechen und die einseitig atomistische Methode zu überwinden, indem er das Ganze der Wissenschaft im Auge behält, ist darum von vorn herein wolwollend zu begrüssen. Doppelt ist solch ein Versuch aber willkommen zu heissen, wenn er von einem scharfsinnigen, methodologisch und, auch im Sinne der Lautforschung, philologisch geschulten Kopf ausgeht, wie er uns in der vorliegenden Abhandlung begegnet.

Nur wenig ist bisher auf dem Gebiete geschehen, das sich der Verfasser erwählt hat, so sehr auch gerade hier das Fragmentarische der Ueberlieferung Scharfsinn und Combinationsgabe des Philologen reizen mögen. Leider ist uns ja von der Sprache der vielen Germanenstämme, welche während der Völkerwanderung auftreten, fast nichts als Personennamen, und auch diese meist in

verderbter Form überliefert. Hierzu kommt noch, dass wir von den lateinischen und griechischen Schriftstellern, denen wir ihre Erhaltung verdanken, nur einzelne textkritische Ausgaben besitzen, dass somit die Arbeit des Forschers unendlich erschwert wird. K. Meyers Schrift über die Sprache der Langobarden muss in vielen Beziehungen für ungenügend gelten, und es bleibt daher nur übrig, was J. Grimm in der Geschichte der deutschen Sprache für die Lösung dieser Fragen auf ostgermanischem Gebiete geleistet hat.

Mit Recht betont Wrede in der Einleitung dass die Namenforschung, welche die Untersuchung hier notwendig sein muss, vom Standpunkte des Dialectes zu betreiben sei, um zu positiven Resultaten zu gelangen. So mangelhaft das wandalische Sprachmaterial auch ist, das sich auf ca. 53 Namen beschränkt, so scheint es uns doch als habe der Verfasser einige nicht unwesentliche Unterschiede vom gotischen Sprachbestand festgestellt. Denn da uns von dem letzteren ja das meiste Material überliefert ist, so hat man es bis jetzt kaum unternommen, auf strenge Scheidung der übrigen wandilischen Dialecte zu dringen.

In klarer, kritischer Weise behandelt unsere Schrift im ersten Teile die Quellen, welche die wandalischen Sprachreste bis zum Jahre 1000 überliefern. Es ist nach unserer Meinung völlig berechtigt, wenn der Verfasser hierbei den Lateinern grössere Zuverlässigkeit zuschreibt als den Griechen, zumal die ersteren weit mehr in persönliche Berührung mit den Wandalen kamen als die letzteren und darum weit eher nach dem Gehör berichten konnten. Am deutlichsten wird dies vielleicht bei der Ueberlieferung von *Geisariſ*, dem Namen des berühmten Wandalenkönigs. Während sämtliche lateinische Quellen bis zu Geisariſ' Tod den ersten Bestandteil des Namens als *geis-* (got. **gaiza*, ahd. alts. *gēr*, an. *geirr*) geben, berichten die Griechen in bunter Mischung *Γεζέριχος*, *Γεζέριχος*, *Γινζέριχος*, etc. Die letztere Form hat schon J. Grimm (Gesch. d. d. Spr. 477) dazu verführt den Namen aus got. *gans*=*anser* zu erklären. Da wir nun nicht wol annehmen können, dass sich der Wandalenkönig mit zwei Namen geschmückt habe, wovon ausserdem der erster nur völlig gesichert ist, so glaube

ich, dass die Form *Γινζέπιχος* eine griechische Ungenauigkeit ist, die sich auf spätere lateinische Schriftsteller forterbte. Auch ohne romanischen Einfluss anzunehmen mag das *v* sehr wohl aus nasalirter Aussprache des Diphtongen *ei* entstanden sein wie sie durch den Zischlaut begünstigt wurde und heute noch in Dialecten vorkommt.

Im zweiten Teile seiner Schrift behandelt der Verfasser die Namen, welche sich ihm aus seiner Quellenuntersuchung ergeben haben. In der Herstellung wie in der Deutung der einzelnen Namen ist der Verfasser gleich scharfsinnig und meist ebenso glücklich verfahren. Einzelnes ist hier schon von Ehrismann Ltbl. VIII, 468 ff. berichtet worden. So erinnert dieser zur Etymologie des Namens Wandalen mit Recht an *wendesé*, *wendelmer*, die schon Förstemann herbeizog, ebenso an *Wendel* als Namen des Teufels. In der Herstellung der Namen *Gamâth*, *Gabadus* und *Theudarju* wird Wrede trotz Ehrismann wol Recht behalten. Bei *Thrasamund*, der sonderbarer Weise auch als *Transamund*, wie Genserich neben Geisarix erscheint, wäre wol nicht blos an got. *prasa-balpei*, sondern auch noch an den westgotischen *Thursimuud* zu erinnern. Beide Formen könnten dann auf die gemeinsame Wurzel *dhars* 'mutig,' 'kühn,' 'dreist sein' zurückgeben, wozu altir. *trén* 'heros,' 'vir fortis,' gr. *θρασύς* an. *purs*, ags. *pyrs* ahd. *gaturst* mhd. *turst*, *dürse* zu vergleichen wären (cf. Kremer Beitr. VIII, 418; H. Zimmer K. Zeitschr. xxiv, 207; J. Grimm Gesch. d. d. Spr. 195). Interessant ist es natürlich in *Hasdinge* und *Theudarix* zwei Namen unserer Heldensage zu begegnen.

Im letzten Teile der Abhandlung hat der Verfasser dem mangelhaften, vielfach unsicheren Character seines Materiales gemäss vorsichtig die grammatischen Resultate seiner Untersuchungen zu ziehen versucht. Da er sich selbst den "Mut des Fehlens" zuschreibt und sehr wol weiss, dass er meist nur Andeutungen geben kann, so ist es höchst überflüssig die Schulmeisternase zu rümpfen, wenn die positiven Resultate der aufgewandten Mühe nicht zu entsprechen scheinen.* Die Gründe, die Wrede dafür beibringt, dass auslautendes *s* im Wandalischen nach Dentalen bereits zu schwinden angefangen hat, sind jedenfalls

ernstlich zu prüfen. Als absolut sicher erscheinen mir dagegen des Verfassers Ausführungen über den diphtongischen Character von wand. *ei* sowie die Schlussfolgerungen, die er hieraus gegen Bremers Auffassung von got. *ai* vor Vokalen (*saian*, *vaian* Beitr. XI, 51 ff.) zieht.

Anziehend sind die allgemeinen Andeutungen, über germanische Namengebung am Schlusse des anregenden, fleissig und scharfsinnig gearbeiteten Buches, in dem wir einen schönen Anfang wissenschaftlicher deutscher Namenforschung erblicken, welchem der Verfasser hoffentlich recht bald das beabsichtigte gotische Namenbuch wird folgen lassen.

JULIUS GOEBEL.

Die erste Person Pluralis des Verbums im Altfranzösischen. Dissertation for the Doctor's degree at the University of Strassburg, by ALFRED LORENTZ. 45 pp. 1886.

It is known to every student of French that the various endings of the 1st pers. plur. in Latin in the tenses that have survived, with the exception of the perfect, resulted in the French form *-ons*. The following forms appear in Old French: (1) *-ons* and its variants, as *-oms*, *-omes*, *-ommes*, *-ums*, etc.; (2) *-iens*, *-iem*, etc.; (3) *-iens*, *-iems*, etc., in the Imperf. Ind. of all conjugations; (4) *-mes*, in the three words *faimes*, *dimes*, and *ermes*. They correspond to the following Latin endings: (1) *-imus*; (2) *-ē(b)amus*, *-ī(b)amus*; (3) *-ēāmus*, *-īāmus*; (4) *-imus*. The remaining forms, viz. *-amus*, *-ēmus*, *-īmus*, and *-ābāmus*, have left no trace.

Thurneysen, in his treatise 'Das Verbum *être* und die frz. Konjugation,' Halle 1882, was the first to explain satisfactorily the influence of the *-ons* ending, originally belonging only to *sumus*, on the development of all other verbs.

*Die Art und Weise, wie sich die verschiedenen "Schulen" unter einander belobhudeln oder gegenseitig zu vernichten suchen, ist ja allbekannt. Durch einzelne Wendungen wie z. B. in *partibus infidelium* verführt, glaubte ich auch in Dr. Karstens Recension von Pauls Principien einen parteiichen Ton zu entdecken (cf. Decembernummer der NOTES). Inzwischen habe ich jedoch vom Verfasser selbst erfahren, dass er denselben keineswegs beabsichtigte und ich freue mich daher meine Auffassung wie meine Anmerkung zu jenem Artikel hiermit berichtigen zu können.

The thesis of Mr. Lorentz adds no new material to this acknowledged theory, except the suggestion that *habemus* in its Old French form was first affected by *sumus*, as the *Moralium in Job* shows only *avomes* beside *somes*. The value of the thesis consists in the collecting and sifting of the different forms, and grouping them according to their geographical distribution. As more than sixty texts have been carefully searched, the investigation may be called a thorough if not an exhaustive one. Realizing the difficulty of becoming acquainted with dissertations that are not published in journals and that therefore easily escape attention, we hope the communication of the results of the present thesis will be of some service to students in Romance dialectology.

The difference in endings shows plainly the existence of two groups of dialects, one of which wholly rejects *-iems* and takes only *-oms* and its representatives, while the other adopts both. The former, moreover, never uses *-omes*, the latter never *-om*. These two groups are the West French (Poitou, Aunis, Saintonge, Angoumois, Touraine, Maine, Manche and Normandy) and the Anglo-Norman on the one side, and the rest of the continental French dialect on the other. West French *o* is represented in Anglo-Norman by *u*. The West French form *-om* changes to *-ø*, later written *-on*; *-ons* is used in the twelfth century only for the sake of the rhyme, and so with *-uns* in Anglo-Norman. Probably *-um* was also nasalized, though retaining its form.

The second group (Champagne Namur, Cambrai, Belgium, Flanders, Brabant, Hainault, Artois, Picardy, Beauvoisis, Vermandois, Ile de France) has only in the pres. ind. *-oms*, *-ons* etc., the other tenses have also *-iems*, *-iens* etc.

We recognize three further divisions: (1) East French, the dialects of Wallonia and Hainault, showing *-ons* in the pres. ind., and *-iens* in the pres. subj. and impf. ind. and subj. In the last two dialects and that of Champagne are to be found *-omes* and *-iemes* in the respective tenses, at least since the thirteenth century.—(2) *-ons* and *-omes* in the pres. ind. and subj., are to be found in the North French district; the exclusive use of *-iemes* is met with only in Picardy and Artois.—(3) In the Central

French dialect *-ons* and *-iens* are used indifferently, with the exception of the pres. ind., which knows only *-ons* or sometimes *-omes*; *-ons* predominates in the North and *-iens* in the South; the first form seems to be used exclusively in Beauvoisis.

This thesis will prove a valuable help for the study of the Old French dialects. The microscopic inquiry has proved, for instance, that *-omes* does not necessarily characterize the dialect of Picardy, as was formerly supposed. Some of the most genuine documents of that region never employ it. The results acquired also tend to overthrow the hypothesis of Prof. Suchier (Gröber's *Zeitschrift* I, 277) and of Jenrich (*Die Mundart des Münchener Brut Halle*, 1881), who assign the Brut of München to the dialect of Namur. Besides the occurrence of the *-uns* forms, which points to a connection with the Anglo-Norman, there seem to be other reasons for the untenableness of Jenrich's opinion. These we propose to consider in a later article.

H. SCHMIDT.

Cornell University.

BRIEF MENTION.

One of the significant accessory features of the second convention of the Modern Language Association of Germany, held at Frankfurt in the last Easter Holidays, was the publication, under the general title of 'Frankfurter Neuphilologische Beiträge,' of a *Festschrift der Neuphilologischen Sektion des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts in Frankfurt a. M. zur Begrüssung des zweiten allgemeinen deutschen Neuphilologentages* (Frankfurt, 1887, 8vo., pp. xii, 136). It opens with an informal account of the origin and activity of the "Neuphilologischen Sektion" of Frankfurt, by Direktor Arthur Kortegarn. This is followed by an extended study of "La Critique littéraire de Sainte-Beuve," written by Armand Caumont, who quotes the remark of Edmond Scherer: Il faut avoir connu Sainte-Beuve, pour savoir l'importance qu'il attachait à l'orthographe d'un nom propre, à un renseignement, à une date. Il voulait tout voir de ses propres yeux, tout vérifier. Il avait vraiment la religion des lettres." Dr. Ludwig Römer

contributes an article entitled "Zwölf französische Lieder aus dem 16. Jahrhundert." One of the literary diversions of Dr. Edmund Stengel, the indefatigable Professor of Romance Languages at Marburg, is the collection and publication of the private correspondence of eminent philologists. He offers us here two letters from Ferdinand Wolf and Emanuel Geibel, and extensive contributions from the correspondence of the Brothers Grimm with several of their Frankfurt friends. Dr. Ferdinand Michel has a study entitled "Handschriftliches zu Les Tournois de Chauvenci von Jacques Bretel." One of the coincidences of similar work done at the same time at widely distant points is marked by Oskar Winneberger's "Textprobe aus der altfrz. Überlieferung des Guy de Warwick," considerable extracts from one of the unpublished MSS. of which (Bib. Nat. 1669) are given in the study of "Guillaume de Dole," appearing in the recent volume of 'Transactions of the Mod. Lang. Ass'n of America.' The last article is by Dr. Max Banner; it is entitled "Das Französische als Unterrichtsgegenstand an unsren Gymnasien." The predominance of critical studies in French in the above showing is noteworthy.

In *Science*, for December 23, '87, is to be found a short notice of Saintsbury's 'A History of Elizabethan Literature;' for January 13, '88, an account of the recent Fifth Annual Convention of the Modern Language Association of America, held at the University of Penna. (Philadelphia). A review and characterization of the work of the same Convention, from the pen of Dr. Julius Goebel, appears in the New York *Belletristisches Journal* for January 27th. The *University Review* (Organ of Garfield University) for December, 1887, contains an Article on "Modern Languages" by J. S. Griffin, Professor of Modern Languages in that University. The December Number (1887) of *The Academy* (Syracuse, George A. Bacon, Editor) has a characteristic and important article (pp. 385-397) on "Aims and Methods in Modern Language Teaching," by Samuel Thurber, Master in the Girls' High School, Boston.

Following close upon the first appearance of Grandgent's Italian Grammar, recently

noticed in these columns (II, 465), comes to us the third edition of a little work of similar form though different treatment, entitled 'A Manual of Italian Grammar, with Comparative Tables and Historical Remarks, by W. L. Montague, Professor of French, Italian and Spanish in Amherst College (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1887. 12mo, pp. 114). The method of this grammar is purely descriptive, there being no exercises introduced, except one in pronunciation, which in addition to its special purpose "will be of service in the application of the various facts respecting the parts of speech as they are consecutively learned in the grammar." The grammatical statements, however, are illustrated by translated examples. The preface to this book received the authors signature in 1874, nor have the subsequent years, so far as the reader is informed, suggested the propriety of any changes or additions. Yet the occasion of offering a new edition to the public might have been utilized to give another form to certain features and statements of the work. Thus, as throwing light upon the information that Dante's classification of the Italian dialects has been modified since his time, other authorities than that of the "35th vol. of the North American Review" might appropriately have been mentioned. Care should have been taken to eliminate such misleading comparisons (for the plural forms) as that given on p. 17 for the definite article:

Sing. ILLE, ILLUM, ILLAM: *il, lo, la*;

Plur. ILLI, ILLOS, ILLAS: *i, gli, le*;

while a comparative table in which, for example, are confronted (p. 34), without any suggestion of a reconciliation, such forms as ILLAE (elleno), ILLARUM (di loro), ILLIS (a loro), ILLAS (loro, le), must be mystifying rather than suggestive to beginners. As to the 'historical remarks,' we find (p. 15) a note of some length accounting for the origin of the plural *s* in French, but of the Italian plural forms (including that in *-a*) no explanation is offered. The statement, however, is made that there are many "euphonic changes" in the formation of the plural: "1. Nouns ending in *ca* and *ga* take an *h* in the plural, in order to preserve the hard sound of the *c* and *g*," etc., etc.—On p. 37 the etyma of *questo, cotesto, quello* are

given as QUEM ISTUM, QUID ISTUM, QUEM ILLUM; and on p. 42 Sp. *quienquiera*, *cualquiera* are set down as the etymological equivalents of It. *chiunque*, *qualunque*, the corresponding Fr. *quiconque* being misprinted *quinconque*. On the same page we are told that "Si is used less frequently than *on* in French, to represent an indefinite subject; . . . but when the following *accusative* is plural the verb agrees with it. Ex. *Si vedono molte persone*."—Further on (p. 45), occurs the remarkable statement that "In the Provençal these forms [of the analytical future] were never combined, as in French, Italian and Spanish, to form a single word, and AD VOS DICERE HABES is written *vos-dir-ai*, or *dir-vos-ai*."—Again, on the same page, "The Spanish imperfect subjunctive in *ara* and *era* is formed from AREM, EREM of the same tense in Latin."—P. 74, "Ci and vi as adverbs of place are contractions for *quinci*, here; *quivi*, there."—In the chapter on 'derivation,' no account is taken of vowel quality and position, or of tonic accent.—With the exception of these, and some other *corrigenda*, the essential facts of the language are here conveniently grouped and plainly stated.

'Die Werke des Troubadours N'At de Mons,' by W. Bernhardt, forms volume eleven of the Altfranzösische Bibliothek (Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger, 1887; pp. XLIX, 169). This poet, who belongs to the decadent epoch of Provençal literature, is not mentioned in the old MS. biographies, a neglect which all his contemporaries shared, save Guiraut Riquier. From a study of the historical allusions in his works, which are almost entirely didactic, the editor arrives at the following conclusion: N'At de Mons came from Toulouse; he wrote in the second half of the thirteenth century and was a contemporary of Alfonso X., of Castille, and Peter III., of Aragon. His death occurred about 1290. The poems, now edited for the first time, are five in number, contained in a single MS.; to them the *sirventes* already published (Bartsch, Chrest., col. 303) is added, which completes the sum total of what has been preserved. From passages and citations in the 'Leys d'Amors,' it is evident that many shorter poems were written by the same author and are now lost, —the fate which overtook the

greater part of the literature of South France. Unfortunately for the present popularity of N'At de Mons, the remnants of his literary baggage have little other than linguistic worth: his longest poem, in 2059 six syllable couplets, addressed to Alfonso X., treats of the influence of the stars on human destiny; the remaining five are on topics not more attractive. The editor has consequently devoted the greater part of the introduction to the language of the poet and of the MS., to comments on the flexion and versification. A short criticism, in which Dr. Foerster differs from certain views of the editor, is appended. Following the text are extended remarks and notes. It will be noticed that in this publication a departure from strictly French texts is made for the 'Altfranzösische Bibliothek.' That the precedent is to be followed appears from the announcement of other volumes on Provençal.

To the same field belongs the 'Vie de Saint George, poëme provençal' by C. Chabaneau, (Paris, 1877), a reprint from the *Revue des langues romanes*. The text is unaccompanied by notes, and represents merely the Provençal version of the favorite legend, evidently imitated from some French original. In the few remarks that precede the text, the editor has evidently overlooked the fact that the episode of the widow (v. 380 ss.) is common to the French poems and their Latin original (See *Zeitsch. für roman. Philologie*, v, 508). Also "le poëme de Wace sur le même sujet" is, without doubt, not by Wace but by some anonymous poet, later by thirty years or more (See *Zeitschrift für roman. Philologie*, v, 504).

At the last meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, held at the University of Penna. (Philadelphia) during the Christmas holidays, 1887, a Phonetic Section of the Society was formed for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the study of phonetics in this country. The desire is to place the practical teaching of this subject upon a more scientific basis, especially in our colleges, and to develop, as far as circumstances will admit, a spirit for scientific research in it. As a practical step toward the accomplishment of this object, it is proposed by the members specially interested, to urge that broader scope be given

to this subject in public and private instruction, to establish courses of lectures suitable to promulgate correct views concerning it, to arrange a system of exchanges in phonetic literature, and to give, by correspondence, to inquirers in phonetic matters such help as may be thought adapted to their various circumstances and needs. To secure agreement as to the general mode of sound notation to be used, a committee will endeavor to formulate a standard system which will be submitted for suggestions and improvements to all those who take special interest in the subject, and it is hoped that the result of their united efforts will meet with general approval. Equipped with this standard alphabet, young scholars will be able to record intelligibly the various dialect shadings of American speech, of whatever origin, and thus prepare the way to examine critically the interesting phenomena of speech mixture in this country. Suggestions from any quarter touching a definite system of Sound notation will be welcomed by the Committee. The veteran phonetist, Alexander Melville Bell, has accepted the presidency of the newly formed section and Professor Gustaf Karsten of Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., has been appointed Secretary; to the latter should be addressed all communications relating to the subject of phonetics.

We take pleasure in announcing that the new American Folk-Lore Society, preparations for which have been for some time making, is at present definitely organized under the presidency of Prof. F. J. Child of Harvard. The Society will hold an annual meeting, but does not promise a yearly volume of Proceedings and Transactions. In lieu of this, a quarterly journal will be published, to be furnished to members of the Society in consideration of an annual membership fee of three dollars. It is hoped that the first number of the proposed journal will appear in April next. The Acting Secretary of the Society is Mr. W. W. Newell of Cambridge, Mass., to whom those interested may address themselves.

JOURNAL NOTICES.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR NEUFRAZÖSISCHE SPRACHE UND LITTERATUR. BAND IX, HFT. 6. REZENSIONEN. Koerting, H. Victor Fournel, *Le vieux Paris; fêtes, jeux et spectacles*.—Heller, H. J. F. C. Peterssen, *Aus Frankreich. Bilder und Skizzen*.—Frank, Josef. Arthur Tilley, *The Literature of the French Renaissance. An introductory Essay*.—Bornhak, G. Paul Kahnt, *Gedankenkreis der Sentenzen in Jodelle's und Garnier's Tragödien und Seneca's Einfluss auf denselben*.—Mahrenholtz, R. Gustave Larroumet, *La Comédie de Molière, l'auteur et le milieu*.—Mahrenholtz, R. W. Kreiten, *Molière's Leben und Werke*.—Koerting, H. R. Mahrenholtz, Jean-François Regnaud. —Hartmann, K. A. Martin. *Neue Erscheinungen der Hugo-Litteratur*.—Heller, H. J. Jan ten Brink, *Litterarische Schetsen en Kritieken: Émile Zola*.—Heller, H. J. Jan ten Brink, *1. Het Naturalisme is good, etc.*—Scheffer, W. C. C. Fleuriot, *Auswahl französischer Sprichwörter mit deutscher Übersetzung und Erklärung*.—Sarrazin, Joseph. *Frankfurter Neuphilologische Beiträge*.—Rambeau, A. *Lehr und Übungsbücher für den Schulgebrauch*.—Bergholter, W. Xavier de Maistre, *Prascevie ou La Jeune Sibérienne*.—Sarrazin, Joseph. *Schulausgaben*.—Lion, Th. C. *Schulausgaben*.—**MISZELLEN.** Barrelet, Charles. 1) J. Racine, *Die Gerichtsfexen*.—Wespy, L. Auguste Vitu, *Les Mille et une Nuits de Théâtre*.—Mahrenholtz, R. J. Grand-Carteret, *La France jugée par l'Allemagne*.—Heller, H. J. Victor Cherbuliez, *La Bête*.—Heller, H. J. Catulle Mendès, *Zo'har, roman contemporain*.—Rambeau, A. *Nachtrag zu Zschr. IX, 2, S. 32 ff.; S. 39 ff.*—Schulze, O. *Zu Zschr. IV, S. 182 ff.*—**Supplé, Theodor.** *Bemerkungen zu dem deutsch-französischen Teile des Enzyklopädischen Wörterbuchs von Sachs (grosse Ausgabe)*.—**HFT. 7. ABHANDLUNGEN.** Dammholz, R. *Studien über die französische Sprache zu Anfang des XVII. Jhrhds. im Anschluss an J. de Schélandre's Tyr et Sidon, Tragédie comédie divisée en deux journées*.—Mahrenholtz, R. *Émile Zola's Selbstbekenntnisse im Roman expérimental*.—**MISZELLEN.** Richter. *Von den losen Fächsen dieser Welt, nur eine Übersetzung aus dem Französischen des Jean Bouchet*.—Mahrenholtz, R. *Doutes sur les Opinions reçues dans la Société*.—Wespy, K. Eugène Sue, *son exil en Savoie 1852-1857*.

LITERATURBLATT FÜR GERMANISCHE UND ROMANISCHE PHILOGIE.—Nov. Behaghel, Otto. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergl. Grammatik der indogerman. Sprachen I.*—Ehrismann, G. Wrede, *Ueber die Sprache der Wandalen*.—Symons, R. *Volo spó. Aus dem Altnord. übersetzt von A. Heusler*.—Mogk, E. Gering, *Glossar zu den Liedern der Edda*.—Sprenger, R. Reinhard Fuchs. Hrsg. von Reissenberger. —Koch, Max. Schmidt, *Charakteristiken*.—Proescholdt, Ludwig. Markscheffel, Thomas Kyds *Tragödien*.—Kressner, Adolf. Saure, *Auswahl engl. Gedichte; Groppe und Hausknecht, Auswahl englischer Gedichte*.—Ehrismann, G. Vogels, *Die ungedruckten latein. Versionen Mandeville's*.—Morf, H. Ziesing, *Erasmus ou Salignac? Etude sur la lettre de Franç. Rabelais*.—Stiefel, A. L. Wenzel, *Studien über Antoine de*

Montchrétien.—**Mahrenholtz, R.** Kreiten, Molières Leben und Werke.—**Meyer, W.** Horning, Die ostfranz. Grenzdialekte zwischen Metz und Belfort.—**Goerlich, Ewald.** Wendelborn, Sprachl. Untersuchung der Reime der Végèce-Versification des Priorat v. Besançon.—**Reinhardtstoettner, C.** Michaëlis, Wörterbuch der portugiesischen Sprache.—Bibliographie. Literarische Mittheilungen, Personalsnachrichten etc. Lyon, Erklärung. Kahle und Kauffmann, Erwiderung und Antwort. Kolmacevsky, Zu Ltbl. V. 104 ff. und VIII, 391 ff.

ANDOVER REVIEW.—December. **Wood, C. J.** Dante Gabriel Rossetti.

NEW ENGLANDER.—December. **Whitney, E. Dr.** Furness's "Othello."—January. **Brastow, L. O.** Cabot's Life of Emerson.

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE.—January. **Holden, E. S.** A New Light on Balzac.—**Brownell, W. C.** French Traits—Intelligence.

DEUTSCHE LITTERATURZEITUNG. No. 48.—**Roethe, G.** Die Gedichte Reinmars von Zweter (J. Seemüller).—**Michaëlis, H.** Neues Wörterbuch der portugiesischen und deutschen Sprache (Wilh. Storck).—No. 49. **Meyer, P.** Alexandre le Grand (E. Schröder).—No. 50. **de Nolhac, Pierre.** La Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini (A. Pakscher).—**Ottmann, R. E.** Grammatische Darstellung der Sprache des althochdeutschen Glossars (G. Kossinna).—**Brunning, J.** Le théâtre en Allemagne (1200-1700).

LITERARISCHES CENTRALBLATT. No. 48.—**Grober, Grundriss, (Kn).**—**Knuist, H.** Gualteri Burlael liber de vita et moribus philosophorum.—**Ortner, M.** Reinmar der Alte. Die Nibelungen.—No. 51. **Adlington, W.** The most pleasant and delectable table of the marriage of Cupid and Psyche (G. N.).—No. 52. **Golther, W.** Das Rolandslied des Pfaffen Konrad (Kn).

REVUE CRITIQUE. No. 47.—**Levi, I.** Le Roman d'Alexandre, texte hébreu anonyme, etc. (R. Duval).—No. 48. **Müntz, E. et Fabre, P.** La Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVe siècle (P. de Nolhac).—No. 49. **Meyer, P.** Fragments d'une vie de saint Thomas de Cantorbéry (C. Bémont).—No. 50. **Combes, E.** Profils et types de la littérature allemande (A. Chuquet).—No. 51. **Scherer, W.** Aufsätze über Goethe: 2. **Schmidt, E.** Charakteristiken: 3. **Lessing, Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Schriften:** 4. **Wolff, E., Karl Gotthelf Lessing:** 5. **Lachmann, K.** Gotthold Ephraim Lessings sämtliche Schriften (A. Chuquet).

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES. 1er Décembre. **Brune- tière, F.** Théophile Gautier.

NUOVA ANTOLOGIA.—Fasc. XXIII. **Nencioni, E.** "Cose Viste," da Victor Hugo.

NINETEENTH CENTURY. December. **Gosse, E.** The French Society of Authors.—January. **Arnold, M.** Shelley.

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.—January. **Saintsbury, G.** The Present state of the Novel, II.

NEW PRINCETON REVIEW. November.—**Warner, C. D.** Shelley—**Vincent, M. R.** Dean Plumptre's Dante. January, 1888.—American Authors and British Pirates.—**Twain, Mark.** 1. A Private Letter and a Public Postscript.—**Matthews, Brander.** 2. An Open Letter to Close

a Correspondence.—**Baylor, Frances Courtenay,** Hidalgo: the Washington of Mexico. Men of Letters at Bordeaux in the Sixteenth Century.

REVUE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT DES LANGUES VIVANTES.—Novembre. **Halbwachs, G.** Les Morts du Baccalauréat.—A... Les Langues Vivantes au Baccalauréat des Lettres.—**Un Orientaliste.** Notes sur la Langue Anglaise (suite).—**Vallat, G.** Thomas Moore, imitateur de Catulle et de Tibulle.—**Kont, I.** Matériaux pour servir à l'Histoire des Etudes Allemandes en France au XVIIIe siècle.—Varia.—Concours de 1887. Agrégations et Certificats d'Aptitude.—Traductions.—Licence des Langues Vivantes. Session de Juillet, 1887.—Bibliographie.—Décembre. **Sarrazin, Gabriel.** Essai sur Wordsworth.—**Forscher, Z.** Emile Deschamps, traducteur de Poésies allemandes.—**Elgin, L.** Maîtres d'Ecole et Professeurs au XIXe siècle en Allemagne.—**Malgrot, N.** Les Langues Vivantes dans l'Enseignement spécial.—Concours de 1887. Agrégations et Certificats d'Aptitude (Allemand et Anglais). Traduction des Versions. Certificats d'Aptitude de l'Enseignement primaire. Traduction.—Revue des Cours et Conférences. Sujets et Devoirs.—Concours de 1888. Auteurs du programme. Bibliographie.—Errata.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHES CENTRALBLATT.—Inhalt; **Prof. Sachs.** Über französische Lexikographie.—Berichte aus den Vereinen: Hannover, Karlsruhe.—Kartellverband neuphilologischer Vereine deutscher Hochschulen (Statistisches, Dissertationen).—Prüfungsordnung für Lehrerinnen der franz. u. engl. Sprache.—Litteratur: Besprechungen (Engl. Gesch. d. franz. Litt.; Regel, Thackeray's Lectures; Lion, Biblioteca italiana; Horning, Ostfranzösische Grenzdialekte; v. Hamel, la chaire de français; v. Hase, Buchgewerbe; Hatton, Gay World; Hodgson, Unrest; Halse, Weeping Ferry; Tharp, Cradled in a storm; Tanger, Engl. Namen-Lexikon; Morley, History of English Literature; Braddon, Like and Unlike).—Neue Erscheinungen. Inhaltsangabe von Zeitschriften.—Miscellen: Konnte Shakespeare Französisch? Académie française.—Antworten.—Bemerkungen.—Anzeigen.

FRANCO-GALLIA.—December. Abhandlungen.—**Kressner,** Entwurf eines Lehrplans für den französischen Unterricht an der höheren Bürgerschule.—Besprechungen und Anzeigen. I. Philologie.—**Wolter,** Lehr- und Lesebuch der französischen Sprache I.—Programme zur Methodik des französischen Unterrichts (Schöpke, Ein Wort zur Reform; Günzel, Der französische Unterricht in den lateinlosen höheren Unterrichtsanstalten; Jäger, Der französische Anfangsunterricht in Gymnasien; Seeger, Mitteilungen über die Organisation des französischen Unterrichts in den Mittelklassen).—**Marelle, Le petit Monde.** 3e édition.—**Stange,** Auswahl französischer und englischer Gedichte. 2. Auflage.—**Hönninger,** Fahrten nach Mond und Sonne.—**Ten Brink,** Emile Zola und seine Werke. Übersetzt von Rahstede.—Zeitschriftenschau.—II. Belletristik.—**Jules Verne,** Le Chemin de France.—**Cantacuzene-Altiéri,** Une Exaltée.—**Le Prince Napoléon,** Napoléon et ses détracteurs.—Revue.—Neue Publikationen. I. Philologie und Pädagogik. II. Belletristik, Geschichte, Geographie, Philosophie.